

*A REIOINDRE TO M.  
IEWELS REPLIE AGAINST  
THE SACRIFICE OF THE  
MASSE.*

In which the doctrine of the Answer to the .xvij. Article of his Challenge is defended, and further proved, and al that his Replie conteineth against the Sacrifice, is clearly confuted, and disproued.

*By Thomas Harding Doctor of Diuinitie.*

*Luke. 22.*

Doo ye this in my Remembrance.

*Irenaus lib. 4. Cap. 32.*

Christe (at his last Supper) taught the new Oblation of the new Testament, which the Churche, receiuing it of the Apostles, offereth vp vnto God through the whole worlde.



LOVANI,

Apud Ioannem Foulerum, Anno. 1567.  
CVM PRIVILEGIO.



*REGIA MAIESTATIS PRIVILEGIUM*  
*THOMAS HARDINGO*  
**R**egia Maiestatis Privilegio concessum est Thoma  
Hardingo Sacra Theologia Professori, ut Librum in-  
scriptum A Reioindre to M. Iewels Replie against  
the Sacrifice of the Masse, per Typographum aliquem lura-  
tum imprimere, ac impunè distrabere liceat.

Datum Bruxellis. Callend. Septemb.

Anno. 1567.

Subsig.

De La Torre.



## TO M. JEWELL.



**B**ICAUSE this tale hath nowe oftentimes ben told you M. Jewell, that in your bookes you corrupte and falsifie the holy Scriptures by priuate interpretation, that you denye certaine General Councils, as for lacke of age and yeres, that you misconstrue other most Auncient Councils, and Fathers, partly by figuratiue Phrases, lightly applied in very weighty matters, partly by paring away their wordes, yea sometimes by lopping of certaine their whole workes (which and such other the like, haue ben hitherto, as it is wel knowē, your ordinary and shameles shiftes): I thought good at this time writing particularly vnto you, to touche briefly some other mater, that might more edifie, if not to cal you home againe vnto the Church wherein you were baptized, who seme to stande obdurate in y<sup>e</sup> you haue once attempted, yet to stay some, and to reuoke others, to the felowship of that Citie and companie of God, which was neuer hidde vnder the Busshel sithens the first erection and publication of it, but stooode alwaies vpon a Hil, and can by no meanes be at any time hidde, as Christe him selfe hath warranted vs, the Prophetes haue fortolde vs, and the Psalmes haue sounded vnto vs. Math. 23.

## TO M. IE WEL.

And thus to do I am the rather moued, for that some of your Ministers, and many of your deceiued fauourers, as we heare say, seing now your forgeries espied, your corruptions detected, your lies manifested, your insufficiencie brought to light, beginne to take an other way, how to abuse the people, kepe some credite, and cōtinue the course of your pleasant Gospel. Yea forsooth they say now, that these controuersed points be no maters of the Faith, no Articles of the Crede, but Schole points of indifferencie, and that it sufficeth to beleue in the Father, in the Sonne, in the holy Ghost, and to beleue the birth, passiō and resurrectiō of Christ, y rest at libertie.

They, that teache this dangerous peece of doctrine, seme to skimme of the froth of that olde Nouatiā Heresie, not calling to remembrance Chore, Dathan, and Abiron, who, as S. Cyprian saith, beleued in one God, Cyprian.  
lib. 1. epist. worshipped one God, called vpon him, and lyued in like Law and Religion, as Moyses and Aaron did. Yet because they diuided them selues by schisme from the rest, and resisted their Priestes and Gouvernours, Gods heauy hande lighted on them.

And touching this mater, who seeth not that there be expressed in the Crede other Articles to be beleued of them, which wilbe saued, as to beleue the Church, Remission of sinnes, euertlasting life, and that the beleeefe in the Trinitie excludeth not these, and that in these

## TO M. IE WEL.

these there is not one meaning among Heretiques, and Catholikes, not one and the same Lavve of the Crede, as S. Cyprian calleth it? For when they be asked, beleue you Remissio of sinnes, and life euerlasting through the Church, they answer not truly. For they haue not y Church, without the which there is no Remission, and then can it not auaille them to beleue in the Father, the Sonne, and the holy Ghoste, as Chore, Dathan, and Abiron had a right beleefe of God, which neuerthelesse were damned. As, touching Faith, it is necessary besides the Article of the Trinitie, to beleue the other Articles, that the Church holdeth: so touching Vnitie, it behoueth a man to ioine him selfe vnto the whole body of Christ the Catholik Church, from the obedience of whose Head, that is the ministerial Head, and gouerneth ouer al vnder Christe, who so euer departeth, he entreth Schisme, and vntil he returne, and be duly reconciled, he remaineth a dead member, as being cut of from the body. The Nouatiā, the Pelagiā, the Donatists, erred not in the Article of the Trinitie, yet are they reputed Heretikes of condēned memorie. S. Augustine auouched that the beleefe of y Pelagians was not sufficient, although they touched not the Manichees. maladies. For (saith he) there is no then one kind of infection, as of bodies, so of mindes.

The Donatistes beleued in the Trinitie, vsed  
a ij Baptisme,



TO M. IEWEL.

August. in  
Psal. 54.

Baptisme, read the Gospel, kepte the feastes of Martyrs, and the solenitie of Easter. In these they vvere vvith me, saith he, and yet not altogether vvith me. In Schisme not vvith me, in Heresie not vvith me, in many things vvith me, in a feyve, not vvith me. In those feyv, by the vvich (they were) not vvith me, the many could not helpe them in vvich (they were) vvith me. In al the Sacramentes vvith me, in only Charitie not vvith me.

Marke wel this M. Iewel, and consider of it aduisedly. Be the pointes wherein ye dissent from vs, I meane from the Catholique Church, neuer so fewe, and neuer so smal, as they be many, and great in dede: if ye ioine not in charitie and vnitie with the Church, ye are not annumbred with the Church, ye are not of the Church. If not of the Church, then haue ye not parte with Christ, whose Passiõ worketh the effecte of saluation only vpon the membres of the Church.

Tom. 2.  
Eol. 263.

Luther the Founder of this fifth Gospel geueth this Censure of you, and of your felowes of Peter Martyrs, and Caluines schoole. Frustra illi in Deum patrem, & filium, & Spiritum sanctum credunt. omnia (inquam) hæc nihil illis prosunt, quando hunc Articulum negant, eumq; falsi

TO M. IEWEL.

falsi insimulant, qui de Sacramento dixit, Hoc est corpus meum. They beleene in God the Father, and in the Sonne, and in the Holy Ghoste in vaine. All these thinges (say I) profite them nothing, forasmuche as they denye this Article ( he meaneth the Article of Christes real Presence in the Sacrament ) and make him a false reporter, who said of the Sacrament, This is my Body.

Gather then therevpon, if Luther him selfe be in any credite with you, that it sufficeth not to confesse the groundes of the Faith in general, as Heretiques do commomly, if there be contempte, or breache in special mater implied in the general: and that to beleene in the Father, the Sonne, and the holy Goste, and to receiue the storie of Christes doinges in flesh, is not ynough, excepte the faith be kepte orderly, and wholly without wicked breache made in any one point.

Neither can you M. Iewel smoothe the worlde vnder the shewe of this beleefe. For were it so that you offended not in Schisme, as Chore, and his Num. 16. felowes did, that you abbridged not the vniuersal Church, as did the Donatistes, that you bangored not in the Sacrament of Baptisme, as the Pelagians, that you denied not the Sacrament of Penance, as the Nouatians, that you bereued not the dead of the Sacrifice of the Church, as the Aërians, that you prophaned

TO M. IEWEL.

phaned not the blessed Sacrament of the Aulter, as the Calvinistes of our time: yet could you not say, that your onely beleeve in the Trinitie, and of Christes chiefe doinges, is a sauing beleeve. For infidelitie or vnbeleeve  
*Basil. lib. de Spiritu sancto.* about any one pointe of those thinges that are to be beleeued, is an vtter denial of the whole Godhead, saith S. Basil.

What vntruth you mainteine in many and great pointes of the Faith, I may let passe in silence, sith your selfe haue in publique audience professed it, by open writings confirmed it, and doo stil defend it. Some of your erroneous pointes I haue detected, and confuted, and so other learned men haue confuted many others. Let that be iudged by those who can indge, and vnto whom iudgement belongeth. Let it be tried, how you beleeue not truly, and wholly in the Godhead.

We may beleeue Christe, who is our Lorde and God, and we may beleeue in Christe. To beleeue Christe, is to beleeue that Christe is. To beleeue in Christe, is to beleeue al to be true, that Christe spake and taught, with beleeuing to loue, and with beleeuing to go into him, to cleaue vnto him, and to be incorporate in his members, as S. Augustine teacheth, that is as muche in effecte, as with beleeve to haue Charitie.

*Augustin Iohan. Tract. 29. De verb. Dom. Ser. 61. & in Psal. 77.*

For

## TO M. IEWEL

For he that hath Faith without Charitie, beleeueth that Christe is, and yet beleeueth not in Christe.

If we should here discowse vpon some particulars of your newe deuised Faith, and precisely presse what S. Augustine saith is to beleue in Christe, your Faith and doctrine were like to be prooued no faith.

Christe is true God, equal with God the Father, and therefore as he is God, he is not a Priest no more then his Father is, nor, as God, euer made he any Sacrifice. You teache in the. 14. Diuision of your Re-  
 plie in your. 17. Article. pag. 578. (Whereto now I haue made answer in my Reioindre) that Christ touching his Godhead, vvas the Priest, and made the Sacrifice, for these be your very wordes. Of which you can not excuse your selfe by saying, they are the wordes of any Doctor. For neuer was there any that so taught, or said. Which wordes are cleane contrary to y<sup>e</sup> Faith, which the holy Scriptures do teache, and which hath bene beleued in the Church euermore. And by the same you seme to haue an other Christe, then we haue. For our Christe in one person hath two natures: to wit, the Nature of God, and the Nature of Man. Touching the Godhead, or the nature of God, he is in no point at al, in any one iote, lesse then his Father. For the Godhead receiueth no degrees. Neither can any thing be said, deuised, or imagined, touching the  
M. Iewell  
maketh  
Christe a  
Priest,  
and to  
haue  
made Sa-  
crifice, ac-  
cording  
to his  
Godhead.  
V Which  
is hei-  
nous he-  
resie.



## TO M. IEWEL.

*Iohn. 10.* Godhead, which is not altogether comō with, Father, and the Sonne: as he him selfe said, *Ego & Pater vnum sumus.* I and the Father are one (thing, nature, or substance). And the Apostle saith, of Christe, that, Being in the forme of God, he thought it no robbetrie to be equal vvith God. Yet say you, Christe, touching his Godhead vvas the Priest and made the Sacrifice: Of which, these absurdities and most horrible blasphemies do folowe.

*Philip. 2.*

1. First, that, whereas to do Sacrifice, is cultus Latræ, a seruice of worship, and a recognizing of superioritie in him to whom the Sacrifice is made: Christe, making Sacrifice to his Father, touching his Godhead, as you say, is inferiour to his Father, and doth seruice to his Father, touching his Godhead.

2.

Secondly, seing that Priesthood is a dignitie, and an excellencie, such as in this worlde none is greater, or at the lest a Qualitie: if Christ be a Priest touching his Godhead, as you M. Iewel do say he is: vndoubtedly either God the Father also was a Priest, and had the same Qualitie, or els God the Father wanted one dignitie or Qualitie, which God the Sonne had touching his Godhead. But God the Father neuer was Priest: Ergo, as before you made Christe inferiour to his Father touching his Godhead, for makinge Sacrifice to his Father as beinge God: so nowe you make  
Christe

TO M. IEWEL.

Christe Superiour to his Father, for hauing an Excellence, Dignitie, or Qualitie touching his Godhead, which God the Father had neuer.

Thirdly, you make by this meanes twoo seueral and distincte Godheades of God the Father, and God the Sonne. For if to be a Prieste belongeth to the Godhead of Christe, the same also belongeth to the Godhead of the Father. But Priesthood belongeth in no wise to God the Father: Ergo, the Godhead of the Father, and the Godhead of the Sonne, are twoo manner of Godheades of seueral and distincte powers, not equal, and one, the one Godhead hauing Priesthoope, the other hauing not, or, whiche is al one, the one God beinge a Prieste, and the other being no Prieste: Whereof wil folowe, there are twoo Goddes, not One onely God.

O horrible blasphemie. After these longe Schismes, and multiplying of Heresies, our Protestants are nowe come to be right Arians, and professed enemies to the most blessed Trinitie.

If to auoide this most haynous and detestable Heresie, you wil say, that God the Father also touching his Godhead is a Prieste, then tel vs, what hath he to sacrifice? To whom shal he do that humble seruice and worship? Or is he a man also as Christe is,

b ij and

## TO M. IEWEL.

Patro-  
pasiani.

and did he suffer death, as the olde Heretikes taught,  
called thereof, Patropasiani?

The Truth is. Christ touching his Godhead is not  
a Priest, ne made not the Sacrifice touching his God-  
head (as very blasphemously you haue written): but  
only touching his manhood.

Marke the point good Reader, as being of most  
weighty importance. Christe is both God, and Man.  
But what he doth touching the manhoode, that doth  
not the Father, nor the Holy Ghoste in the same  
sorte. Marie, what he doth touching his Godhead, that  
in al pointes God the Father, and God the holy Ghost,  
doth equally with him. Which is the cause that for-  
ceth vs to beleue, that not the Godhead, or whole Tri-  
nitie tooke fleshe, but only the second person in Trini-  
tie: Least if the Godhead had done it, or if it had bene  
done touching the Godhead, we should be constrained  
to say, the whole Trinitie was incarnate, which is a-  
gainst our Faith. Now if Christe touching his God-  
head coulde do that, which the Father and the Holy  
Ghoste should not do: the Godhead were diuided, and  
peaces, or partes were made thereof (it being immu-  
table, indiuisible, one, and most excellently perfect)  
so that touching that parte of the Godhead, whiche  
were in Christe, Sacrifice might be made, but tou-  
ching that, which were in the Father, and the Holy  
Ghost

TO M. IEWEL.

Ghoste, sacrifice might not be made.

Here we shal trie how this nowe broched Arian, wil purge him selfe. Here shal we see, whether this Heresie shal also be soothed, bolstered, and shouldered vp, as your other Heresies are, or no. Last of all here shal we see, whether you wil recant, and retract this abominable Heresie, as in your Sermon of the 15. of Iune last at Paules Crosse, you promised and protested to doo, if you could be conuincd of any. Of this I say no more. But if this blasphemie may be mainteined in this newe English Church, vndoubtedly this English Church (o pitifull case) wil proue a professour of Arianisme, yea I feare, at length of worse, if worse may be. Certainly our Christe neuer taught this doctrine, neither was euer any such thing attributed vnto Christe by Gods worde, nor by the Catholike Church: wherefore you seme not to beleue in our Christe.

Christ said of the Spiritual Rulers, he that heareth you, heareth me, he that despiseth you, despiseth me, and so taught obedience vnto his Church, and also vnto that chiefe Governour, whom he instituted Head of the same, and appointed to be his Vicare. For whereas he said, feede my shepe, he meant, that the sheepe should obey him, whom he ordeined their feeder, or Pastor. Whereof it foloweth, that who so euer refuseth to be fed, that is to say, to be governed

Luc. 10.  
Ioan. 21.  
b ij and



TO M. IEWEL.

and taught, by that general Shepeherd, he forsaketh  
*Math. 25.* the state and order of a sheepe, and becometh a Goat,  
 and therefore to be placed at the lefte side, when the  
 great Shepeherd of al Shepeherdes shal come to sorte  
 his flockes. Christ commendeth vnto vs the Sacrament  
 of Penance, in which if we sinne after Baptisme, we  
 are reconciled to God by a Priest, whereunto Confes-  
 sion of sinnes belongeth. Christ also requireth per-  
 fourmance of Vowes. This doctrine you receiue not,  
 you teache it not. You beleue not our Christe.

*Iren. li. 4. cap. 32.* Christ (saith S. Irenæus) at his last supper tooke in-  
 to his handes the creature of bread, blessed, and gaue  
 thanks, saying. This is my body, and taking the  
 Cuppe likewise, he confessed it to be his bloude,  
 and taught the newe Oblation of the newe  
 Testament, vvhich the Church, receiuing it of  
 the Apostles, offereth vp to God in the vvhole  
 vvorld. Christian people hath euer bene taught  
 from the Apostles time to this day, that to be his  
 true Body, and his true Bloude, whiche are offered,  
 an vppon credit of Christes saying, doo adoure and  
 worship the same. You teache not this doctrine. You  
 beleue not, that Christes wordes do implye this much,  
 you teache the contrary. Thus you beleue not in our  
 Christe.

That Christe sitting at the right hande of his Fa-  
 ther

TO M. IEWEL.

ther in heauen, is at the same time in the handes of them who receiue the Sacrament of the Aulter, bothe Sacrifice, and Sacrificer (as S. Chrysostome teacheth and the Church beleeueth) you teache not, you receiue not, you beleeuue not. Whereas Christ consecrateth the hoste by the ministerie of the Priest, saying, this is my body, this is my bloude: his saying being true, and you not beleeuing, how beleue you in Christe?

Christ said, A Citie built vpon a hil can not be hidde, meaning it of his Church built vpon him selfe. Math. 5.

You teach, y<sup>e</sup> the true Church of Christ hath ben hidde these al most a thousand yeres, and so hidde, that before Latherstime, al Christians were in palpable darknes. How then beleue you in Christ? Christ said to his Disciples bearing the person of al<sup>y</sup> Church. Behold, I am Math. 28. vvith you al daies vntil the end of the vvorld.

And againe. I vvil pray my Father, and he vvil geue you an other cōforter, to remaine vvith you for euer, the Spirite of Truth. Marke wel good Reader, Al daies: For euer: and, The Spirit of Truth. But you M. Iewel, and your good fellows do teache plainely, that the whole Churche of Christ was guided in Truthe by the Holy Ghost, only for the space of: 600. yeres: and therefore you limit, and prescribe the trial of Controuersies to that age onely. As for these later so many hundred yeres; you say,

TO M. LEWEL.

you say, the Pope hath blinded the whole worlde. You beleue then in a Christe of 600. yeres only, not in our Christe and Sauour, which promised to remaine with his Church, Al dayes, no daye or yere intermitted, euen to the vvorlde's ende.

August. in  
epist. lo-  
ban. tra-  
bat. 6.

Nay beleue you in Christ at al? S. Augustine teacheth, that Heretikes beleue not, that Christ came in flesh. Charitie (saith he) brought him vnto flesh. VVho so euer therefore (thus he concludeth) hath not Charitie, he denieth that Christ came in flesh. And to proue that an Heretike hath not Charitie, thus he reasoneth. Tu non habes Charitatem, quia pro honore tuo diuidis vnitatem. Thou hast not Charitie, bicause for thine owne honours sake thou diuidest vnitie.

There for sure trial of Preachers, whether they haue the spirite of God, or no, comparing them, as S. Paule doth, to earthen pitchers, he biddeth men to prooue them by the sounde. Pullate, tangite vasa fictilia, ne fortè crepuerint, & male resonent. Knocke the earthen pitchers (saith he) tinke them with your fingers, least perhaps they be crackte, and geue a broken sounde. You are crackte, you are crakte M. Iewel. We haue knockte you, and we finde, that your sound is not whole. How so? Bicause you haue not the Charitie and loue of vnitie.

You

TO M. IEWEL.

You say (I knowe wel) y<sup>f</sup> you haue Charitie, and that ye diuide not the Vnitie, but that we the Papistes (for so ye cal the Catholiques) be they, by whom the Vnitie is diuided. No, no, M. Iewel. It wil not serue you so to say. For when men were once One, and in one Auncient felowship or Communion (as ye and we were in One Auncient Church, before Luther brake the knot) he diuideth Vnitie, which departeth from his felowes and former godly companie, to ioine him selfe with a newe companie, not he who abydeth stil in the former Auncient companie. Say therefore what ye wil, S. Augustine plainely prooueth, that ye are they, which haue broken the Vnitie. For this cannot be denied, which by him is spoken, as it were to your person: Tollis te ab vnitare Orbis terrarum &c. Tract. 6. in epist. Iohan.

You vvithdravv your selfe from the vnitie of the vvhole vvorlde. You diuide the Church by Schismes, you rent the bodie of Christ. He came to gather together, you crie out to the ende to set a fundre. It is you M. Iewel, and your felowes, that diuide your selues from the Vnitie, in whiche the whole worlde was ioined and knit together. We remaine in that Faith, which we founde the worlde in when we were borne, and in whiche the worlde hath continued sithens the Apostles time. You shal neuer be hable to shewe, that ( Orbis

c      terra



TO M. IEWEL.

terrarium) the round world is at this day, or euer was, of your side.

Will ye haue it appeare euidently, howe ye deuide yourselues from the Vnitie of the worlde? Your selues do confesse it in the Apologie of your English Synagogue more then seuen times. There ye affirme, that Frier Luther, and Zuinglius were the firste that beganne to set abroad the Gospel, and that al the light was quite extinct, and that al the fontaines of the pure water of life were vitterly dried vp, before they came.

Thus it is cleare to the simplest wittes that are, forasmuche as ye condemne the vniuersal Church dispersed ouer the whole worlde, departe from it, and ioyne your selues to Luther, Zuinglius and Caluine, that ye make breache of the Vnitie. Of al this it is concluded, that you lacke Charitie, and therefore though ye haue neuer so much Faith, by S. Augustines doctrine, wel may it be, that ye beleue Christe, but in Christe ye beleue not.

Tjt. i. If it be so then that ye beleue not in Christ, (whiche neuer the lesse S. Augustine declareth to be vnderstanded in respecte of deedes, not of wordes, for many confesse Christe vvith mouth, and denie him vvith deedes, as S. Paule saith) and that therefore chiefly ye beleue not in him, because

## TO M. IEWEL.

cause ye are voide of Charitie, as being gone from the Vnitie of the whole worlde: so many as loue Christe, and feare to lose the parte they hope to haue with Christe, wil study how to kepe them selues like sounde wheat in the safe Floure of Vnitie, and wil not by the puffes of any your preachinges, or writings, seme Ephes. 4. they neuer so sweete and pleasant, suffer them selues, like light Chaffe, to be scattred into your damnable sectes and diuisions.

Neuerthelesse, if ye glorie, and crake of the multitudes that ye haue in our countrie of England, where the trompettes of your pleasant Gospel haue ben sounded, and twite vs of our smal number (smal I meane in respect of such as make open profession there to be Catholikes, for otherwise Gods secret and vnknown number doubtlesse is right great): we tel you, a Pecke of wheat is more worth, then a Sacke of Chaffe. Then remember ye withal, Math. 3. when the Winower shal come with his Fanne, the wheat shalbe layd vp in his Garner, the Chaffe shalbe cast away into vnquencheable fyre. God send you grace to see the perilous state ye stand in, and both to beleue in Christ rightly, and otherwise as to saluation is behooful: that so the people, for whom Christ hath shed his bloud, be no more with most certaine losse of their soules seduced by you, and so to ioine in vnitie with y<sup>e</sup> Catholik and Vniuersal Church. Which

TO M. IEWEL.

When I shal vnderstande , I shal right hartily re-  
ioise in you , as nowe I am right sorry for  
you , and with good wil , if euer I  
write vnto you , say (whiche  
2. Ioan . nowe I may not say)

Fare wel.

\*  
\* \*

Thomas Harding.

August. Contrà literas Petiliani Donatistæ.

Lib. 2. Cap. xcij.

*An non est ista vestra fallacia, sed error humanus est?  
Vinam ita sit: emenda ergo, non inde eris minor: imò ve-  
rò maioris ingenij est animositatis flammæ confitendo ex-  
tinguere, quàm falsitatis nebulas intelligendo vitare.*

Say ye, that this is not a false parte plaid by you, but humaine  
errour? I pray God it be so: amende then, sticke not at it, thou  
shalt therefore be neuer a whit the worse man: nay it is a point  
of greater wit to quenche the flames of stourdy conceite by  
confessing that is amisse, than by sharpenes of vnderstanding to  
auoide the clowdes of falshode.

*The Preface to the Catholike Reader touching  
the Sacrifice of the Masse.*



I can not be vnknownen vnto thee, Christian Reader, what a do there hath ben in these daies about the Masse. Many scoffe, and skorne at it, and after most vnworthy wise reuile it. Some make Argumentes against it, and labour to bring it in contempte, with written treatises. Others haue gone about to ouerthrow it with a penal Lawe, whiche punisheth them, that heare Masse, or be present at it, with imprisonment of their persons, and with losse of great summes of money. But if it be certaine, that the most worthy Sacrifice of the Masse is of Christes Institution, most acceptable to God, and the thing sacrificed Christ him selfe, as in this Reioindre thou shalt finde it prooued: what is there, why thou shouldest regard the first sorte, more then the Iewes, that passing by our Sauour Christe, as he hoong vpon the Crosse, reuiled him, wagging their heades, and saying, *Vah*, as muche to say, *Phy on thee, or, out vpon thee*: The seconde, more then the two false Witnessses, who deposed against Christe, as he was conuenced before Caiphas: The thirde, more then Caiphas him selfe, and the Aldermen of the Iewes, that brought Christe bounde, and deliuered him vnto Ponce Pilate, to be condemned to death?

Concerning the Ciuile Iusticers the Executours of this Lawe, as it becommeth me not to say muche: so yet I may be so bolde, as to put them in minde, that, what

The disc  
pylers of  
the Sa-  
rifice not  
to be re-  
garded.

*Math. 27*

*Math. 26*

*Math. 27*

## THE PREFACE TO

Lawe so euer is vniust, God shal iudge the Promotours, the Makers, and the Ministers of the same. I wish hartily, they would deeply consider of that God saith by his Prophete Esaie, which among other thinges he commaundeth to be cryed out alowde, as with the sounde  
*Esaie . 58.* of a trompet. *Dissolue the bandes of impietie, loose the burdens, wherewith men are overcharged, let go free them that be oppressed, &c.* Certainly it is such a Lawe, as the like was neuer before heard of in any Christian Realme.

As for the Argumentes, and what soeuer other deuises our Aduersaries haue inuented against this Sacrifice, because al procedeth of fallhoode, malice, and ignorance, by reading this Preface, and my Reioindre, the truth being declared, I trust al shal vanish away, and seeme worthy of no credit in their iudgementes, whom the loue of Heresie hath not bewitched, bereued of wit and vnderstanding.

And as touching them, that mocke, scoffe, and raile at the Masse, As Moyses, and Aaron standing before  
*Exod. 5.* King Pharao, said, *The God of the Hebrewes hath called vs, that we go soorth into the wildernesse three daies iourney, and sacrifice vnto our Lord, least perhaps the pestilence, and sworde come vpon vs:* Euen so if we Priestes, and Catholike men be mocked, euil reported, and euil iudged of for that which we doo at the Masse, we confesse plaine-ly, for so much as we ought not to be ashamed of it: that according to Christes commaundement we offer vnto  
*Luc. 22.* our Lorde God this Sacrifice in remembrance of Christes death, and for our necessities, and that according  
*1. Tim. 2.* vnto the exhortation of S. Paule, we make *supplications, prayers, intercessions, thankesgeuing, for al men for Kinges,*  
and



and foral that are in auctoritie, that we may liue a quiet and peaceable life, in al godlines, and chastitie. For that (saith he) is good and acceptable in the sight of God our sauour, who wil al men to be saued, and to come vnto the knowledge of the truth. For there is but one God, and one mediator betwen God and men, the man Christe Iesus, that hath geuen him selfe a raunsome for al men. These be the thinges, that we do in the Masse. What reprove they deserue, we see not. Yet these, be the thinges, for which we susteine persecution.

This being so, to thentent they finde cōfort according to the exhortation of Christe in the Gospel, which suffer persecution for the Masse, sith it is *for righteousnes sake*, and that the persecutours seing them selues deceived, take better aduise, repent, and amende: and that the truth of this point be more clearely knowen: I thinke it good, and profitable, here to say somewhat of Sacrifice in general, and of the Sacrifice of the Masse. Math. 5.

How be it this muche at the beginning I confesse, that, what is, and euer hath ben in the Church agreed vpon, as a thing certaine and cleare, thereof reason is, we should not dispute, least by disputing, we make the thing doubreful, that is most certaine. Therefore here, I meane in this Preface, I intende not to bestow my labour, to the intent by Argumets I may seme to proue a thing, that in the Church is already defined: but to this ende rather minde I to employ myne endeuour, that as touching this point of Diuinitie, I may confirme it, not so much by way of reasoning, as by way of expounding: whereby it may come to passe, that the truth being declared, the darkenes of errors be put away.

That

## THE PREFACE

What  
things  
be inten-  
ded in  
this Pre-  
face.

That I may procede orderly, which I may not wel do in my Reioindre folowing the course of answering to M. Iewels cōfute Replie: I wil briefly declare, first, what Sacrifice is: <sup>2</sup> Why Sacrifice is made, as a thing acceptable, and due vnto God: <sup>3</sup> that a visible Sacrifice is most conuenient for our nature: <sup>4</sup> that God hath bothe engrafted in the mindes of men the rite of Sacrificing, and also by the Law commaunded it, and for what cause: <sup>5</sup> then, that for loue towards vs, Christe hath instituted a Sacrifice for vs at his last Supper, for larger proufe whereof I referre the Reader to this my Reioindre: <sup>6</sup> Furthermore, for so much as in euery Sacrifice foure things are to be considered, according to the doctrine of S. Augustine, *To whom offering is made, by whom it is made, what is offered, and for whom any thing is offered:* <sup>7</sup> I wil shewe in what sorte these be in the Sacrifice of the Masse: <sup>8</sup> After this, by what waie this Sacrifice is auailable: <sup>9</sup> for what causes, and persons it is auailable: <sup>10</sup> what effectes it worketh: <sup>11</sup> Lastly, that the Prayers, and the Ceremonies of the Masse, be good and godly, and voide of al superstition. Of these pointes some I wil but briefly touche, of some I wil speake more largely, as the mater requireth.

Whereas then M. Iewel, and his felowes do so much abhorre and deteste the name of Sacrifice, specially of the Sacrifice of the Masse, as a thing iniurious to the Crosse of Christe, whiche neuerthelesse so much setteth forth the merite and benefite of the Crosse, as nothing more: I would faine they had once plainly signified to the worlde, that they them selues do rightly vnderstand, what a Sacrifice is.

What

What new deuise they haue, and what they imagin thereof, it skilleth not. Let vs see, what the Scriptures teache vs. The blessed Apostle S. Paule going about to declare, that Christe was a true Priest, and that he offered a true Sacrifice for vs, taketh vnto him selfe this definition, saying, *Euery Hye Priest taken from among men, is ordeined for men, in the thinges that apperteine to God, to thintent he offer vp giftes, and Sacrifices for sinnes.* And againe in the same Epistle, *Euery Hye Priest is ordeined to offer vp giftes, and Sacrifices.* Whereof it may be gathered, what Sacrifice is, specially the condition of these *Correlatiues*, Priest, and Sacrifice, considered, betwen which there is a mutual relatiō of the one to the other, as it is betwen Father and Sonne, Maister and Seruaunt: verily that it is, An Hoste, whiche as a gifte and a present, is offered by a publique Minister vnto God for sinnes.

¶ What is Sacrifice as it is taken for the thing that is offered.

And thus may Sacrifice be defined, as the woordes signifieth the gifte offered, and the thing sacrificed. For elles, if we speake of Sacrifice, as it betokeneth the action of sacrificing, for the worde is common to both: then we vnderstand a true Sacrifice, and such as is conuenient for our nature, to be made and offered, when we doo consecrate any gifte to our Lorde God, by which, some rite and ceremonie according to publique ordinance about the gifte obserued, we professe him to be supreme and chiefe of al, the beginning and ende of our health and saluation, so as by that we submit our selues, and al that is ours vnto his diuine Maiestie. Herein what is there, that may seeme iniurious to Christe, or by any meanes vnworthy?

¶ What is Sacrifice as it is taken for the action of sacrificing.

2.

¶ Why is Sacrifice made.

Neither doo we thus offer giftes, and Sacrifices vnto God

d

to God

to God, for that he hath any neede of our thinges, who in him selfe is most sufficient; nor for that he desireth ought at our hands for cause of his owne pleasure, as the carnal Iewes thought: but bicause in such giftes and presentes, the recognition of his supreme Maiestie, is to him most acceptable. And for so much as of his goodnes he hath created vs after his owne Image, and hath ordeined vs to attaine the fruition of his owne blessed presence, where the true blisse is: it is right on our behalfe, and to him acceptable; that to thintet we may acheue this end, which to vs is profitable, and not to him, we geue him wourship due vnto him, and that by what meanes we can, we stirre our selues duely to do it: and that, if by committing sinne, we haue dishonoured, and offended him, and therefore deserue punishment, so farre as our frailtie stretcheth, we make some satisfaction and recompense.

Gen. 1.

Sacrifice  
is the  
propre  
vvour-  
ship of  
God.

And although he be truly wourshipped withe al good workes, that be doone to his glory: Yet properly that wourship is due vnto him, whereby, after the manner that is conuenient for vs, we professe him to be Alpha and O, asmuche to say, the beginning and ende of al thinges, for this is propre to his onely Maiestie. For in asmuche as that exceeding greate excellencie hath infinite properties, whiche for the infirmitie of our nature we are forced with distincte considerations to conceiue, and bicause we are carried vnto God by distincte vertues with distincte affectes and desires, whiche folow the apprehensions of our minde: that the vertues be not as an vnordered heape confuse in the harte of a iuste man, but that eche

VER-

vertue answereth to his proppre consideration, whereby man is carried vnto God (As, bicause God is true and faithful, therefore we beleue him, bicause he is mighty and liberal, therefore we hope in him, bicause he is good, therefore we loue him, whiche three vertues S. Paule setteth forth distinctly writing to the Corinthians) to the consideration, by whiche we conceiue him to be verely our Lorde and God, from whom, as being the *Father of Lightes*, euery good thing descendeth, and in whome, as in the last ende, we put our highest felicitie, properly the vertue of Religion answereth, by which we are woont to sacrifice, that is to wit, to offer vp giftes, and presentes in recognition hereof, whereby we acknowledge and professe, him to be the beginning of our creation, and the ende of our blisse, to whom al that is ours ought to be referred.

*Iacob. 12.*  
Religion,

Therefore the people of Israel were commaunded of God, as soone as they should come into the lande of promise, to take the first fruites of al manner of corne, and to bring them to the Priest, and as he laid them vpon the Aulter, to say in this wise. *I professe this day before thy Lorde God, that I am entred into the Land, whiche our Lorde hath sworne vnto our Fathers that he would geue vnto vs. Our Lorde hath brought vs out of Egypte with his mighty hand, and stretched arme, &c. And therefore now I offer vp the first fruites of the corne of the land, that our Lorde hath geuen vnto me.*

*Deut. 26*

Euen so King Dauid said vnto our Lorde, after the greate giftes had bene geuen by him, and by his Nobles, towards the building of the Temple: *All things are thine (O Lord) and what thinges we haue receiued at thy hande,*

*1. Para. 29*

*d y*

*We haue*



## THE PREFACE TO

*We haue geuen vnto thee.* And thus we offer giftes vnto our Lorde, not for that he hath neede of them, or pleasure in them, with which mynde the Babylonians offered vnto their Idol Bel: but bicause in the giftes so offered, there is a recognition of his Diuine Maiestie, and a certaine satisfaction for sinnes, that is to say, for the temporal paines due vnto sinnes.

**3.** But bicause lyuing vpon the earth, and being enuironned with flesh we vse the senses, and being tied vnto sensible things we can not exercise the proper operations of the soule perfectly: such a Sacrifice is conuenient for vs, as with which visibly we may confesse and honour that Diuine excellencie of Maiestie. For although God, who is spirite, be delighted with that worship, which according to the Scripture, procedeth of spirite, and truth, that is to say, of right faith working by charitie, and although it be a certaine acceptable Sacrifice vnto him, when the soule with inwarde mouing doth consecrate it selfe to God: yet truth it selfe, that is to say, right faith, requireth also outward worship, for two causes.

**Outward  
vvour-  
ship of  
God, re-  
quired  
for two  
causes.**

The one is, bicause the soule maketh not that inward oblation of it selfe conueniently, and perfectly, excepte it beholde the same in some sensible oblation of a gifte, as in a signe and glasse, that by this meane it may be moued and stirred vnto that internal Oblation, thereto rest and stay, as when we pray vnto God, and praise him, we doo it not only with the harte, but also with sensible signes: not bicause otherwise he vnderstandeth vs not, but for that so we stirre and prouoke our selues the more feruently to pray, and praise him, And therefore S. Paule

**Rom. 6.**

ad-

admonisheth vs, that we exhibite, not only our mynde,  
vnto God but also our members, to be *armures of righte-*  
*ousnes.*

The other cause is, for that, as S. Basile saith, we haue  
not onely our soule of God. And therefore the woun-  
dship that is geuen vnto him by the soule onely, is vnper-  
fite. And for so much as we haue receiued the body, and  
al that we haue besides of him: it is right, that we serue  
him with the body it selfe, and with al things, acknowle-  
ging that he is God, and Lorde of al thinges, to whom al  
thinges ought to doo seruice. In consideration where-  
of the thirde brother among the seuen Machabees, put-  
ting forth his tong out of his mouth (as he was cōmaun-  
ded) and holding vp his handes, both to be cut of by the  
tormentour, said, with a bolde courage, *E caelo ista pos-*  
*sideo, sed propter Dei leges nunc hac ipsa despicio.* From hea-  
uen I haue these thinges, but nowe for Gods Lawes  
sake, I care not for them. And so gladly he offered his  
tong, his handes, and al the partes of his body, in Sacri-  
fice to God of whom he had receiued them.

And so the mother of those seuen Machabees, a wo-  
man of manly fortitude, with free harte offered vp her  
sonnes vnto God, bicause it was he (as she said) that had  
created them, and brought them into this light, how so  
euer they had ben conceiued in her wombe. Therefore  
she made protestation as before God, and said vnto them,  
*I know not (quod shee) how ye appeared in my wombe: for*  
*it is not I, that haue geuen vnto you spirite, and soule, and*  
*life, it is not I, that haue ioined together the members of*  
*each of you, but it is the Creator of the worlde. &c.* As  
much to say in effect, as this, Lord for so much as I haue

*in Asceti-*  
*cis.*

God is to  
be honou-  
red not  
only with  
the soule,  
but also  
vvith the  
body, and  
vvithout  
vvard  
thinges.

*2. Mach. 7.*

The Mo-  
ther of  
the Ma-  
chabees.

## THE PREFACE TO

had these seuen Sonnes of thee, for thy sake gladly I geue them, and offer them vnto thee.

*Iob. 1.*

That blessed man Iob likewise, tooke the losse of al his goodes patiently, and so with free hart offered them to God, forasmuch as he acknowledged, that he had receiued them at Gods hande. S. Paule also exhorteth, that we glorifie, and beare God in our body, and that we exhibite our bodies a liuely Sacrifice vnto God. And in that great and first Commaundement, in whiche the Lawe and Prophetes do depende, we are commaunded to loue God, not only with the soule, but also (*ex omnibus viribus*) with al our powers and strength.

*1. Cor. 6.*

*Rom. 12.*

*Matt. 22.*

*Luc. 10.*

And as we sinne against God, not by thought onely, but with outward workes also, and outwarde thinges, as it is euident in fornication, gluttonie, theaste, sacrilege, and in the like: so we be bounde seemely to serue him, not onely with inward motions of the soule, but also with outward thinges, that we haue receiued of his goodnes. Therefore S. Paule gaue preceptes vnto them of Corinth men and women, concerning the head to be vncoouered, or coouered, when they prayed, or prophecied.

*1. Cor. 11.*

Christ also in the Gospel declaring, that internal faith only doth not suffice, saith, *He that confesseth me before men, I wil confesse him also before my Father.* And S. Paule saith, that *with the harte a man beleeueth vnto righteousness, but with the mouth confession is made vnto saluation,* by the mouth vnderstanding euery external worke, whereby confession of our faith is made.

*Math. 10.*

*Rom. 10.*

But what shal we say to those places of the Scriptures, in whiche it is reported, that God hath no liking in the

the outward Sacrifices? *I wil haue mercie, saith he, and not Sacrifice. If thou wouldest haue had Sacrifice, I would haue geuen it thee. With burnt offerings thou wilt not be delited. A troubled spirite is a Sacrifice to God, the contrite and humbled harte, thou wilt not despise. I wil not rebuke thee for Sacrifices.* Of the like places in the Scriptures of the olde Testament, we finde greate numbers. *Ofee. 6. Math. 9. Psalm. 50. Psal. 49.*

To al this S. Augustine answereth. *Sic illa Deum nolle dixit, quomodo ab stultis ea velle creditur, velut sua gratia voluptatis.* The Prophet said, that God would not haue those Sacrifices, in suche sorte as fooles beleue he would haue them, as for his owne pleasures sake. For elles, if he would not haue had them at al, he would neuer haue commaunded them in the olde Lawe to be offered. *And therefore they were* (saith he) *to be chaunged now in their due and certaine reason, least men should beleene, that they were such as might be desired of Gods parte, or be acceptable of them selfe in our behalfe, and not rather those other Sacrifices* (he meaneth internal Sacrifices) *whiche by them were signified.*

Now therefore that those olde Sacrifices be chaunged and abrogated, the time being come, when Moyses Lawe should cease, and haue an ende: Christe in place of them hath substituted the Sacrifice of the Euchariste, greater in vertue, better in profite, easier in doing, and incomparably higher in worthinesse. So then that there may be a perfit profession of the supreme Maieستie, which is to be shewed by very things them selues: We offer vnto it a visible gifte of those thinges which we haue.

The Sac-  
rifice of  
the Eu-  
charist, or  
of the  
Aulter.

## THE PREFACE TO

haue receiued of our Lordes hande, for our sinnes, and for a thankful recognition.

A certain  
change  
required  
in the  
things  
that be  
sacrificed.

2.2.9.85.

art.3.arg.

3.Theoph.

in cap.8.

ad Heb.

Chrysost.

in epist.ad

Heb.Ho.

mil.18.

Leuit.2.

Matc.9.

Then is a giste said properly to be consecrated or hallowed vnto God in sacrifice, whē it is deputed to diuine seruice, with some rite of religion or Ceremonie obserued, whereby some change is made about it. For it is not to be thought, that euery oblation is a Sacrifice, as it is wel noted of S. Thomas, Theophylacte and S. Chrysostome. For as it appeareth in the booke named *Leuiticus*, In al the Sacrifices some rite was obserued, where- by things, that before were prophane, were made sa- cred and holy to the honour of God. For either they were slaine, as the Beastes, or burnt, as the Incense, or sprinkled ouer with oile, as bread, meale, and the first frutes, and baked in an Ouen, or fried in a panne, or roasted on a gredyern, and al things were sauored and ceasoned with salte.

A rite and ceremonie of changing we do obserue in our Sacrifice also now, the bread (beside breaking and eating) by vertue of the woordes of consecration, being changed into the body, and the wine, into the bloude of Christe. By which rite and ceremonie we confesse, that, for so much as we are by nature the children of wrath, we haue nede of a great chaunge, to be made wor- thy of God, that we haue nede to put on the new man, that we protest al that is ours, to be ready for his sake to be changed, to be consumed, to be spent and lost, right so as it shal be his pleasure. For *who so euer doth lose his soule for my sake (saith our Sauour) he shal finde his soule.*

Math. 16.

That to

offer Sac

crifice is

natural,

Now let vs come vnto the fourth point, and declare that God hath both engrafted in the mindes of men the rite



rite of sacrificing, and also by Lawe commaunded it, and for what cause. This is soone done. The consideration of nature, and general view of the worlde, layeth the one before our eyes, and the bookes of the olde Testament, the other.

Natural reason telleth man, that he is vnder some Superiour, for the defectes, which he feeleth in him selfe. In whiche defectes he hath neede to be holpen and directed of some Superiour. And what so euer that is, it is that, as S. Thomas saith, whiche among al is called God. And as in natural thinges, naturally the inferiour thinges are vnder the superiour thinges, euen so natural reason telleth man according vnto natural inclination, that he exhibite to that whiche is aboue man, subiection and honour according to his manner. And the conuenient manner for man is, to vse sensible signes to expresse some thinges, bicause he taketh his knowledge of sensible thinges. And therefore it procedeth of natural reason, that man vse certaine sensible thinges, offering them to God in signe of due subiection and honour, in like sorte as they doo, who offer vnto their Lordes certaine thinges, in recognition of their Lordship or Dominion. This pertaineth to the nature of Sacrifice, and therefore the offering of Sacrifice pertaineth to the Law of nature.

Wherefore there lyueth no Nation in the worlde altogether without Religion, as we may see, and heare, nor is Religion maintained without Ceremonies. And among Ceremonies, the Nations of all ages haue vsed outward Oblation, as the chiefe. Although for the more parte (as S. Cyprian saith) they abhorred Circumcision,

Sacrifice  
hath euer  
ben gener-  
al to al  
peoples.  
Cyprian.  
Serm. de  
ratione  
Circūcis.

THE PREFACE TO

as a thing cruel, and vnfriendly to nature, yet the other Sacrifices they did not likewise abhorre: but *folowing, the lawe of Nature in many thinges* (saith he) they retained the custome of making Sacrifices. And this was fastened in their myndes by common consent in general, that God onely ought to be wourshipped with outward Sacrifice. With that kinde of wourship who euer iudged, that any should be honoured (saith S. Augustine) *but whom either he knewe, or thought, or (at least) imagined to be God?* Of what antiquitie this manner of godly wourship is, the Sacrifices of the two first brethrep, Cain, and Abel, doo shewe.

August. de  
Ciuit. Dei  
li. 10. c. 4.

Gen. 4.

For what  
cause hath  
God en-  
grafted in  
Man the  
rite of sa-  
crificing.

As touching the cause, why it hath pleased God to engraft in the mindes of men the rite of sacrificing, what other can we rendre, but his great loue towardes Mankind? In declaration whereof this muche is to be considered.

Gen. 3.  
Rom. 5.

Ephes. 1.

Gen. 3. 12.  
Gen. 22. 26.  
28.

Deut. 18.

Whereas our first parent Adam seduced by the enuy and craft of the Deuil, brake Gods commaundement, and through his sinne brought sinne into this world, yea such, and so great Sinne, that al proceeding from him according to the flesh, became by nature the Children of wrath, and therefore remained thral to Gods anger, and iust damnation: God of his owne goodnes not willing they should perish, whom he had created, determined with him selfe, and promised to Adam at the beginning, and afterward to Abraham, Isaac, Iacob, Moyses, Dauid, and the other Fathers, to send that blessed seede, Iesus Christe his Sonne, to reconcile vs vnto him selfe, to pacifie his iuste wrath, to wash vs cleane from our sinnes, and to redeeme vs from damnation, by Oblation of a singular

ingular Sacrifice. When the fulnes of time was come, and the daies fully expired that God had appointed, the Sonne of God our Sauour came, tooke our finnes vpon him, offered him selfe vp a Sacrifice for vs vpon the Crosse, appeased the wrath of his Father, and entring once by his bloude into the holy place (as S. Paule saith) founde for vs an euerlasting Redemption. *Galat. 4.*  
 The true and chief Sacrifice, Christes Death. *Heb. 9.*

This Sacrifice of Christe vpon the Crosse, is the onely Sacrifice, whereby we are redemed, and without this, is there no saluation. *With one offering* (saith S. Paule) *Heb. 10.* *he hath made persite for ever them that be sanctified.* And in Esaie it is said of Christe, *Torcular calcaui solus.* The presse haue I trodden alone. And as without and besides this Sacrifice nothing can saue vs, so this is a sufficient price to satisfie God for the Dettes and finnes of the whole worlde. *He is the propiciation* (saith S. Iohn) *for 1. Iohn. 2:* *our finnes, neither for our finnes onely, but for the finnes of al the worlde.* This is the lambe, that taketh away the finnes of the worlde, And God was reconciling the worlde in Christe vnto him selfe, saith S. Paule. *Iohan. 1.* *2. Cor. 5.* The vertue of this Sacrifice reacheth from the beginning of the world to the ende, from the first man to the laste, bothe Testamentes taking their effecte of it, and therefore S. Iohn calling Christe the Lambe, saith, *he was killed from the beginning of the worlde,* verely because his bloude hath cleansed the finnes of men of all ages. *Apocal. 13.*

But albeit this be the Lambe, that taketh away the finnes of the worlde, and though it be the Sacrifice propicia- *Iohan. 1.*  
 e ij picia-

# THE PREFACE TO

piciatorie for the sinners of the whole world, as S. Iohn saith, yet is not the whole world thereby saved. For sure we are, the faithlesse Gentiles, Turkes, Moores, Saracenes, vnbeleuing Iewes, and feined Christians, be not saved. What then shal we saye? This sacrifice is sufficient to saue al men; but it is not effectual to the saluation of al men. The vertue of it is such, as is hable to saue al, yet be not al saved. Wherof commeth this? The defecte is not in God, it is in man. Now behold the goodnes of God.

That this Sacrifice of his Sonne, as it is sufficient for al, so it may be also effectual, for al: God hath ordeined certaine meanes, whereby men may be made hable to receiue the merite of it, and wherby the vertue of it is transferred, and applied vnto them. These meanes be Sacramentes, and Sacrifices. As for Faith, Hope, and Charitie, of necessitie they are presupposed, without whiche neither Sacramentes, nor Sacrifices doo ought auail. For *without faith it is impossible to please God*, and *who so euer loneth not, he remaineth in death*. Likewise where is no hope, there Christes mercie to saluation taketh no place.

Of Sacramentes some be propre to the olde Testament, some to the newe. Of Sacrifices some be inward, some be outward. The inward be knowen, as the sacrifice of a contrite Harte, an humbled spirite, the sacrifice of prayer, praise and thankesgeuing, of mercie, and beneuolence, and other the like. These be common to bothe Testaments.

But as concerning outward Sacrifices, that men might be made partakers of the Oblation of Christe, whiche

Faith,  
hope, and  
Charitie,  
first, and  
chiefly  
required.  
Heb. 11.  
1. Iohn. 3  
Sacra-  
mentes.  
Sacrifices  
double,  
Inward  
Sacrifices  
Heb. vii.

Outward  
Sacrifices.



whiche hath most sufficiently merited the saluation of al men, and that they might transfere the fruite of it vnto themselves; God hath euen from the beginning of the worlde; bothe vnder the Lawe of Nature by Diuine inspiration stirred vp the mindes of men vnto the rite of sacrificing; for wittnes whereof we haue the example of Abel, Noe and Melchisedek, Abraham, Isaac, Iacob, Iob, besides others, and eftsones at what time he gaue the Law by Moyles, he commaunded sacrifices to be made, and shewed the diuers kindes of Sacrifices, as the Paschal Lambe, the continual sacrifice, the sacrifice for the finnes of the Priest, of the Prince, of the people, for ignorance, for geuening thanks, for peace, for chastitie, &c.

The vse of al whiche outward Sacrifices was, not that they should reconcile men to God, and merite saluation by strength of their owne nature, but that by them the mindes of men might be moued, and admonished, to remember the great Sacrifice, that was to come, whereby God promised to redeme al men, that so their faith might be confirmed, and the fruite of it be applied vnto them, hauing faith and truste in the Sacrifice to come: What strength they had in their degree against sinne; they had it not by their owne nature, but by vertue of Christes Sacrifice vpon the Crosse, whereof they were figures and significations.

Of these outward Sacrifices so great an accompt is made in the Scriptures, as necessary for the behoofe of Gods people luyng vnder the Lawe; that the lacke of them is repured in sundrie places for an horrible plague. God threatening the people of Israel, saith by his Prophet Osée, that they should *sitt many daies ( sine sacri-*

Gen. 4. 8.

Iob. 1.

Exod. 12.

Num. 28.

In Leuitico. ca. 4.

The vse

of the

olde sac-

rifices.

Osee. 3.

e. ij

ficio,



# THE PREFACE TO

*ficio, & sine Altari) without sacrifice, and without an Altar.* In an other place he threatened king Asa, and his people, by the mouth of Azarias the sonne of Obed, *that for a longe time they should be without a Priest.* Azarias in Daniel lamentably bewaileth the state of the Iewes, as being greuously plagued, for that they had *neither burnt offering, nor sacrifice, nor oblation, nor incense, nor place where to offer.*

Wherefore if Christe would his Church in the time of the newe Testamēt to be without external Sacrifice, and Priesthod prope to that state, he should seme to haue deliuered vnto his people, not the Testament of grace, but a state of ire and wrath, yea of more wrath, then was the state of the Iewish people. But whereas he saith him selfe, that he came (*pradicare annū Domini acceptū*) *to preache the acceptable yeare of our Lorde*, that is to say, the time of grace, mercie, and saluation, and sith that S. Paul saith, *Behold now is the acceptable time, beholde now is the day of saluation*: verely assured we are, forasmuch as to euery lawe ordeined by God Sacrifice and Priesthod belongeth, prope and conuenient to the same: that God would not suffer his most deare people of the newe Testamēt, his best beloued spouse the Church, to be without external Sacrifice, and Priesthod, the lacke whereof was sometimes threatened to the Iewes for a greuous plague. Neither, to say the trowth, could it in any wise seme conueniēt, that that Religiō, which of al that euer haue ben, is most absolute, should lacke that Service and worship, wherby the external and propitiatorie sacrifice is offered, which Service hath alwaies ben most highly esteemed in euery Religiō, not only in that which is true, and instituted of

ted of God, but also in that which is false, and deuised by the enuie and suggestion of the Deuill, wherein he endeouoreth al that he can, that the Image of the true Religion, as muche as may be, be expressed, and liuely set forth.

Forasmuche then as in the olde Testament, as S. The Sa  
 Paule witnesseth, there wanted perfection, by reason of crifice of  
 the weakenes, and vnhablenes of the Leuitical Priest- the Chur  
 hooode (for *the lawe brought nothing to perfection*) it be- che.  
 houed, God the Father of mercie so disposing, that an Heb. 7.  
 other Priest after the order of Melchisedek should rise, who might make perfite al that were to be sanctified.  
 This Priest was Iesus Christe our Lorde and God. Who, whereas he came not to loose the Lawe (in asmuch as it  
 was Natural, or Moral) but rather to fulfil the Law: when Mat. 5.  
 he brought his new Lawe into the worlde, so much promised before in Ieremie, and th'other Prophetes: least he  
 should haue least it maimed, and vnperfit in this behalfe, Ierem. 31.  
 cōtrarywise then the manner of the former lawes (of nature, and of Moyses) was, either of which had outward  
 sacrifice, furnished it with a peculiar Sacrifice, and Priest-  
 hod. For it could not otherwise be, but that, when a new  
 Lawe tooke place, Sacrifice propre to that Lawe should  
 go with it, and Priestes likewise, as Ministers of the same  
 Sacrifice. For according to the Doctrine of S. Paule,  
 Lawe, Sacrifice, and Priesthode, go euer together.

Therefore though he would once offer him selfe  
 vnto God the Father vpon the Aulter of the Crosse  
 with Death, that he might there pay the price of the  
 raunson of the worlde, and worke euerlasting Redem-  
 ption: yet bicause his Priesthod was not to be exting-  
 uished and ended by Death, and euery Priesthod requirith  
 a pro-

THE PREFACE TO

a proper Sacrifice: at his last Supper, in the night that he was betrayed, that he might leaue vnto his Deare Spouse the Church a visible Sacrifice, as the nature of men required, whereby that bloudy Sacrifice once to be made vpon the Crosse might be represented, and the Memorie of it kept, and the healthful Vertue of it appyled vnto vs, and God duely recognized: at the same Supper declaring himselfe to be constituted a Priest after the order of Melchisedek, according to the dutie of Priesthoode he offered vp vnto God the Father, his body and bloud vnder the formes of bread and wine, and deliuered the same vnto the Apostles, whom then he made Priestes of the newe Testament, that they should receiue them, and by these wordes, *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*, Doo ye this in my remembrance, (vnder which request that his whole action is comprehended) he gaue commaundement to them, and to their Successours in Priesthoode, to offer vp the same. Thus the Church hath alwaies vnderstanded, thus it hath taught, thus it hath beleued. In witness hereof S. Irenaeus speaking of that which Christe did at his Supper, saith, *Novi Testamenti novam docuit oblationem*. He taught the new oblation of the new testament. And this is the doctrine of the Catholike Church, touching the Sacrifice of the newe Testament, simply declared, which Sacrifice is now according to our Lordes Institution, and commaundement offered daily by Priestes, in this office the Apostles successors.

Neither saith S. Irenaeus of this Oblation, onely, that it is the newe Oblation of the newe Testament, and that Christe taught it: but also that the Church receiuing

is of

Luc. 22.

1. Cor. 11.

Iren. lib. 4.

cap. 32.

Ibidem.

it of the Apostles, doth offer this Sacrifice to God ( in vniuerso mundo ) in the whole worlde . Wherefore it is mere madnesse, yea ( if we would speake as S. Augustine speaketh in euery the like case ) it is most insolent madnesse, to dispute, whether in the Masse there be a Sacrifice and oblation or no, and whether the same ought to be continued, seing that the whole Church through the worlde doth celebrate and frequent it .

August.  
Epiſt. 118.  
ad Ianuar.

For good proufe of it we haue the Scriptures, the Doctours of al ages, the auncient Councils, the sense, practise and vse of the vniuersal Church . As for the Scriptures, I thinke it ynough here only to note certaine places, that be alleged for it. They are these, the Institution of Christe described in the Ghospel: the propheticie of Malachie: the Figure of Melchisedek. Vnto whiche may be added the manifest place of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, where S. Paule saith, they could not be made partakers of the Table of our Lorde, who had defiled them selues with taking parte of the Table of Deuils: where, by Table, he vnderstandeth in bothe places the Altar, whereon the prophane meates were offered to Deuils among the Gentiles, and the Euchariste is consecrated, and offered vp vnto God among the true beleeuers, whereof Sacrifice is concluded. For by those woordes it is manifest, that S. Paule doth compare our Euchariste in respect of Sacrifice, to the Sacrifices of the olde lawe, and to the Sacrifices of the Deuils. Whiche thing he would not haue done, onlesse he had ben assured, and onlesse it had ben wel known to the Christiā people, that the Euchariste is so a true Sacrifice, as those that were offered

Auctorities for the sacrifice of the Altar,

Scripture for the Sacrifice,

Luc. 22.  
Malach. 1.  
Gen. 14.  
1. Cor. 10.

f to God



## THE PREFACE TO

to God in the olde Testament, and as those that of the Gentiles were offred to Deuils.

Doctours  
for prouf  
of the  
Sacrifice.

As for the Doctours, their witnessess for proufe here-  
of be in manner infinite. In al their writings where-  
of speake they so often, as of this Sacrifice? Many of  
their sayinges I wil not here reherse, many of good force  
I wil dissemble, and the sayinges of <sup>a</sup>S. Clement, <sup>b</sup>of S.  
Anacletus, <sup>c</sup>of S. Alexander, <sup>d</sup>of S. Dionysius, and <sup>e</sup>S. Ig-  
natiuss I wil not touche. Who as they were either in  
the Apostles time, or soone after, and therefore are the  
rather to be heard: so of this Sacrifice they haue geuen  
forth in writing very plaine witnessse.

<sup>a</sup> Li 8. Co  
stitut.

<sup>b</sup> Apost. &

<sup>c</sup> Epist. 2.

<sup>d</sup> Epist. 1.

<sup>e</sup> Epist. 1.

<sup>f</sup> Eccle-  
siast. Hie-  
rarch. c. 3

part. 3.

<sup>g</sup> Epist. ad

Smyrnen.

& Tralli.

an.

Iren. li. 4.

cap. 32.

Infra. fol.

240. b. etc

Cyprian.

lib. 2.

Epist. 3.

Ambros.

lib. 4. 5. 6.

De Sacra-

ment. &

lib. 5.

Epist. 33.

Verely S. Irenæus speaketh so clearly of it in his  
fourth booke against Valentinus, that by no shifte it can  
be auoided, by no myste or clowde it can be darkened.

M. Iewel hath beaten his wit very muche about it, and  
hath trauailed al that he could, to frame an answer to it  
in his Replie, but he laboureth in vaine, and sheweth  
more wilfulnes, then reason, more talke, then learning, as  
by this Reiondre it shal appeare.

S. Cyprian writing to Cæcilius, saith, that *the*  
*Priest doth then offer in the Churche a true and full sacrifice*  
*unto God the Father, if he beginne so to offer, euen as he*  
*seeth Christe to haue offered.* In whiche place he decla-  
reth how Christe offering his body and bloude in the  
forme of bread and wine at his Supper, exercised the  
office of his Priesthoode after the order of Melchi-  
sedech.

Here I might allege S. Ambrose, in sundry places of  
his bookes *De Sacramentis*, and in his Epistle to the no-  
ble woman Marcellina his sister, where expressly he  
nameth



nameth the Masse, by the name of *Missa*, and the Oblation, that it be not wrested to an other signification. S. Hierome in sundry places of his workes, but specially in his epistle to Euagrius, and to Hedibia, quæst. 2. hath a manifest testimonie of this sacrifice. S. Augustin likewise in many places of his workes. In the. 17. booke *De Ciuitate Dei*, speaking of the Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe, which he doth exhibite after the order of Melchisedek, saith, *Id sacrificium succedit omnibus illis sacrificijs veteris Testamenti, quæ immolabantur in umbra futuri.* This Sacrifice hath come in place of al those sacrifices of the olde Testament, whiche were sacrificed in the shadow of the sacrifice to come. And to thintent we should vnderstand this not to be the bloudy Sacrifice of the Crosse, but the vnbloudy Sacrifice of the Altar: he addeth these wordes to put the Reader out of doubt, *pro illis omnibus sacrificijs & Oblationibus corpus eius offertur, & participantibus ministratur.* For al those sacrifices and Oblations (of the olde Lawe) Christes body is offered, and ministred vnto the receivers.

*De Ciuit.  
li. 17. c. 20*

In his booke of Confessions, he speaketh of this Sacrifice so clearly, as it can not be denied, shewing how it was offred for his Mother Monica that holy woman at her burial. His wordes be plaine. *Neque in eis precibus quas tibi fudimus, cum offerretur pro ea Sacrificium precij nostri, ego fleui.* Neither wepte I in those praiers, whiche we made vnto the (he speaketh vnto God) at what time the Sacrifice of our Price was offered vp for her. In another place he telleth what a great desire she had, not to haue her body sumptuously and honorably buried, but

*August.  
Confess.  
lib. 9. c. 12*

## THE PREFACE TO

*Ibid.* 413 to be remembred at the Aulter of God, unde sciret dispen-  
*fari victimam sanctam, qua deletum est Chirographum, quod*  
*erat contrarium nobis, qua triumphatus est hostis computans*  
*delicta nostra, etc.* From whence she knew that holy hoste  
 (or sacrifice) to be bestowed, by which the hand writing  
 that was contrary to vs, was blotted out, by which the  
 enemy that reckoneth our offenses, was ouercommen. By  
 these two testimonies, bothe the Sacrifice offered at the  
 Aulter, and the Oblation of the same for the Dead, is  
 auouched.

If al were laid together that may be alleged out of S.  
 Augustine in witnes of this Sacrifice, it would fil a booke,  
*Leo serm.* At what time the matter was treated in. Caiphas haue  
*7. de Pas-* (saith S. Leo) How Christe should be killed, then he ordeined  
*sone Do.* the Sacrament of his body and bloud, and taught (his Disci-  
*mini,* ples) what Sacrifice fro thenceforth ought to be offered vnto  
 God. Against these our Aduersaries can take no excep-  
 tion, either for their age, or for their auctoritie.

What shal I speake of the Masse of S. Iames the Apo-  
 stle, and the Masse of S. Basil, allowed by the sixth gene-  
 ral Councel holden at Constantinople, and by al the  
 Greekes, of the Masse of S. Chrysostome, and of S.  
 Ambrose, al whiche the antiquitie acknowleged, and  
 now be extant? In those Masse this Sacrifice, and Obla-  
 tion is oftentimes spoken of, and it is declared, how it is  
 offered.

Hereunto may be added the auctoritie of many Coun-  
 cels, that conteine most cleare witnes of the Sacrifice of  
 the Aulter. Those holy and learned Fathers of the  
 great first General Councel holden at Nice, say, that  
*Councils* it is an unworthy thing, that they which haue not power to  
*for vit.* offer  
*nes of this*  
*Sacrifice.*  
*Casil. Ni.*  
*600, 64, 14.*

offer the Sacrifice (that is to say, the Deacons) should gene-  
 re the body of Christe to them, that offer it. The first Coun-  
 ccel Ephesine likewise acknowledgeth the Vnbloudy  
 Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe, and the  
 true presence of that body, whiche is proper vnto the  
 Worde. The Testimonies of other Councils that fo-  
 lowed these, might easily be alleged for this point, in  
 great number. But these may suffice.

Concil. E-  
 phesin: in  
 Epistola  
 Cyrill. ad  
 Nestorin.

M. Iewel impudently beareth the world in-hand, that  
 nothing can be founde in the auncient Doctours, or  
 Councils, that maketh clearely for the Sacrifice. Yea  
 he pretendeth him selfe to be so sure of it, that he offe-  
 reth freely to yeelde, and subscribe (which it semeth he  
 mindeth not to doo, what so euer be brought) if any  
 learned man of his Aduersaries, or al the learned men  
 aliue, be hable to bring any one sentence out of any one  
 olde Doctour, or Council for it. But his Maister Iohn  
 Caluine, as wicked an Heretique as he was, was neuer  
 so shamelesse, as to denie a thing so manifest, nor so rash,  
 as to graunt so muche. And therefore thus he writeth.

M. Iewvel  
 in his  
 Chalce.

*Veteres Cœnam Sacrificium vocasse notum est: neque  
 possum veteris Ecclesia consuetudinem excusare, quod gestu  
 ac ritu suo speciem quandam sacrificij figuraret, ysdem ferè  
 ceremonijs, quæ sub veteri Testamento in vsu erant, eo ex-  
 cepto, quod panis hostia animalis loco utebantur. Quod cum  
 nimis ad Iudaismum accedat, nec Domini institutioni con-  
 sentaneum sit, minime probo.* That the olde Fathers cal-  
 led the Supper a Sacrifice, it is knowen. neither can I  
 excuse the custome of the auncient Church, for that  
 with gesture, and outward rite, they did set forth a cer-  
 taine forme of a Sacrifice, with the same Ceremonies

Caluinus  
 de Cœna  
 domini

Caluin acs  
 knowles  
 geth the  
 Sacrifice  
 was in  
 the ancie  
 Church.  
 M. Iewvel  
 denieth.

## THE PREFACE TO

Caluin alloweth not the olde Churche: yet must vve needes allow Cal. min 3  
in a manner, that were in vse in the olde Testament, saue that they vsed the hoste of Bread in place of a beast. Whiche thing sith it commeth to nigh to Iewishnes, neither is agreable vnto the Institution of the Lorde, I doo not allow.

Thus M. Iewel should haue tolde histale, if he had folowed the chiefe Inuentour and founder of his Geneuian Gospel, for so besides heresie, he had offended but in pride. But now he hath so proclaimed his Challenge, that besides heresie, and pride, he hath also proued him selfe ignorant, rash, and impudent. And thus is he confuted by his owne chiefe Doctor, who being conuicted with euident truth, with some modestie confesseth that, he could not denie, though with intolerable pride he disallowed that, whiche he was not hable to disproue. So Lucifer knew, that his Creator was aboue him, yet not lyking wel of it, he said, *I wil be like vnto the highest.*

*Esa. 14.*

As concerning the Institution of Christe, that by a cleare declaration of it, it may appeare by the acte of Christe, that at his Supper he offered vp to his Father his body and bloude, it is to be considered, what he did. *Doo ye this* (said he) *in my remembrance.* What this? This very thing, that I now haue done. He tooke bread into his handes, and lifting vp his eyes vnto heauen, (as by as-

*Ambrosius De sacrament. li. 4. cap. 5.* fured tradition the Church hath receiued, and S. Ambrose reporteth it as a thing vndoubted) and shewing it vnto the Father, as we read in S. Iames Masse. he gaue thanks vnto him, as being the author almighty of all thinges, from whom al that good is, procedeth, and as it was accustomed to be done in Sacrifices, with a certaine rite of Religion he consecrated the bread, blessing it, he  
brake

*Iacobus in Liturgia.*

brake it, and gaue it vnto his Disciples to eate, saying, *This is my Body that is geuen for you.* To whom is it geuen? To my Father almighty, to whom as being Lorde of al, I haue geuen thanks. It is geuen I say, to my Father presently without bloudshed, and in a Mysterie, but anon for his willes sake to be rent and torne, and to be put to death. Euen so a litle after he said, lifting vp his eyes also into Heauen, as it is in S. Iohn, *Pro illis ego sanctifico meipsum*, I sanctifie my selfe for them, fulfilling that olde Lawe in deede it selfe, whiche required, that euery first begoten should be sanctified vnto our Lorde, that is to say, be offered and appointed vnto Gods holy seruice. Likewise he tooke the Cuppe, after that he had supped saying, *This is my bloude of the new Testament, that for you and for many is shed, in remission of sinnes.*

Iohan. 17.

Exod. 13.

Num. 8.

Luc. 2.

Mat. 26.

Luc. 22.

This is the visible worke, whiche we doo according to the instruction of Christe, with which by publique auctoritie (bicause Christe so ordeined and commaunded) we professe God to be not onely the beginning and end of al thinges, the founteine of al felicitie, and ende of our desires, but also through the Death of his owne Sonne, the redemer of al men, and the repaier of al thinges, which through sinne we had lost.

That this commemoration ought to be celebrated externally with outward worke, S. Paule plainly signifieth, saying to the Corinthians: *So ofte as ye eate this bread, and drinke of this Cuppe, ye doo shew forth the Death of our Lorde until he come.* For that shewing forth can not be made with the internal commemoration of the minde. Whiche sense is also signified by the verbe of the present tense, *ye doo shew forth our Lordes death, for so in*

1. Cor. 11.

καταγγι-  
σσει

the



## THE PREFACE TO

the Greke S. Paule speaketh.

Touching testimonies that may be alleged for further proufe of this Sacrifice, bicause it is declared and set forth at large bothe in my Answer to M. Jewels. 17. Article, and in this Reiendre, and for so much as the convenient breuitie of a Preface wel beareth not so large a treatie, as the dew opening of this point requireth, and furthermore least by treating of it here I should withdraw thy desire Reader from perusing that, wherewith I haue fortified and made good my Answer: for these considerations I referre thee vnto my Reioindre it selfe.

6. Now let vs see, how the foure thinges, whiche after the doctrine of S. Augustine be required in euery Sacrifice, be found in the most blessed Sacrifice of the Aulter.  
*August. de Trinit. lib 4. c. 14.* <sup>1</sup> To whom oblatiō is made, <sup>2</sup> by whom it is made, <sup>3</sup> what is that whiche is offered, <sup>4</sup> and for whom it is offered.

*To vvho is Oblatio made in the Sacrifice of the Church.* Concerning the first, This doctrine of the Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe, whiche now we are driuen to defende against the Professours of this newe deuised Gospel, was so certainly knowen, and generally holden of al men in the first times of the Church, that the very Arians, who were Heretiques, and enemies of Christe, thought they had founde an inuincible Argument against the Equalitie of the Sonne of God with the Father, bicause in this Sacrifice the Sonne is offered vp vnto the Father. For it is certaine, said they, that *he which is offered, is lesse then he, to whom he is offered.* To whiche Argument, that which Fulgentius, an auncient Father writeth, may serue for answer, who sheweth learnedly writing to *Monimus*, that this Sacrifice is not offered to the Father onely, but to the whole Trinitie.

*If there*

If there be any Catholique beleuers (saith he) that see-  
 med hitherto to be ignorant of this Sacrifice, from hence  
 forth they ought to knowe, that al seruice of euery woun-  
 ship and healthful Sacrifice, is of the Catholique Church  
 exhibited, both to the Father, and to the Sonne, and to  
 the Holy Ghoste, that is to say, to the Holy Trinitie, in  
 whose onely name, it is manifest, that the Holy Baptisme  
 also is celebrated. Neither is preiudice gotten vnto the Sonne,  
 or vnto the Holy Ghoste, whiles prayer by him that offereth  
 is directed vnto the person of the Father, the ending of  
 which prayer, whereas it hath in it the name of the Sonne,  
 and of the Holy Ghoste, sheweth, that no \* oddes is in the  
 Trinitie: because whiles the wordes of honour be directed  
 vnto the person of the Father onely, with the Faith of him  
 that wel beleueth, the whole Trinitie is honoured: and when  
 the intention of him that sacrificeth, is directed vnto the  
 Father, the gifte of the Sacrifice with one and the same  
 dewtie of the offerer, is offered vnto the whole Trinitie.  
 Thus Fulgentius.

Fulgen-  
 tius lib. 2.  
 ad Moni-  
 num.  
 Oblation  
 is made  
 to the  
 most  
 blessed  
 Trinitie.

\* discrimē

When Christe the Sonne of God, is offered vp ac-  
 cording to his body and bloude, that is to say, according  
 to his humaine nature, according to whiche, he is lesse  
 then the Father, then him selfe, then the holy Ghost: he  
 is consecrated vnto the holy Trinitie. And so much doth  
 the Church in the lesse Canon, and specially in the  
 ende of the Masse professe, with expresse wordes na-  
 ming the Trinitie it selfe.

Therefore S. Augustine saith, that, ~~whereas~~ Christe  
 Iesus in the forme of God taketh satisfaction with the Father,  
 with whome he is one God, yet in the forme of a seruant  
 he had rather be a Sacrifice, then take Sacrifice, least by

August. de  
 Ciuit. Dei  
 li. 10. c. 20  
 Christe is  
 sacrificed  
 in the  
 forme of  
 a seruant,

## THE PREFACE TO

this occasion some man should thinke, that Sacrifice were to be done to any creature. By this he is a Priest, him selfe both the offerer, and him selfe also the offering. Of which thing he willed the daily Sacrifice of the Church to be a Sacrament, which Church whereas it is the body of him selfe the head, is taught through him to offer up it selfe.

Masses in  
honour  
and me-  
morie of  
Sanctes.

Although sometime the Church do celebrate certaine Masses in the honour and memorie of Saintes, yet it doth not offer Sacrifice vnto them, but vnto the Trinitie only, that hath crowned them, and geuing thanks vnto God for their victories, sueth for their aides, and desireth to be holpen by their merites, and prayers. Wherof S. Augustine treateth, *Lib. 8. De Ciuitate Dei. cap. ult. lib. 20. Contra Faustum. cap. 21.*

2.  
By vvhō  
is this Sa-  
crifice  
made.

Concerning the second point, which is, by whom this Oblation and Sacrifice is made, among some men there is some doubt thereof. For some say, that Christe offereth not, but that we only do offer. Others there be, that wil Christe here also to be the Priest, who wil seme to leane to the authoritie of S. Ambrose, and of the Laterane Councel. *Now Christ is offered* (saith S. Ambrose) *but he is offered as man, as receiuing passion, and he offereth him selfe as a Priest, to forgiue our sinnes.* The Councel hath thus. *There is one vniuersal Church of the faithful, in which the selfe same Priest is the Sacrifice Iesus Christe.*

*Amb. lib. 1. Officiorum. c. 48. De Summa Trinit. & fide Cath. cap. firmiter.*

*Heb. 7.*

If our Lorde, because he is a Priest for euer according to the order of Melchisedeck, haue an euerlasting Priesthode, as S. Paul saith, although he offered him selfe vnto the Father with death in the Altar of the Crosse to pay the price of mannes redemption: yet his Priest-  
hoda

hode was not extinguished by death. Wherefore, as in the Epistle to the Hebrewes S. Paule concludeth, it is necessary, that he haue also that, which he may offer. But whereas it is not Christe him selfe in his owne person, but a man Priest that standeth at the Altar, who with the wordes of Christ doth consecrat and offer this Sacrifice, as to this purpose he is assumed: the learned Fathers of the Councel of Trent, haue discussed this controuersie with three wordes. For *the Hoste* (say they) is *one and the selfe same*. He the same now offereth by the ministerie of Priestes, that offered him selfe vpon the Crosse with a diuers way onely of offering. Whereof it followeth, that both Christe, and also we, here are Priestes, he, bicause he consecrateth by our ministerie, we, bicause we consecrate in his person, and with his wordes. For whereas he said to his Apostles, *Do ye this in my remembrance*, after that he had offered him selfe vnbloudily at the Supper, as he is now offered in the Altar: the Apostles so vnderstoode him, the Holy Ghost geuing them suche sense, or Christe by expresse wordes so teaching them, that they should consummate, and make perfite this Mysterie, in the person of him, and with his wordes. Which of an assured tradition of the Church that can not be deceiued, the auncient Fathers haue alwaies taught, and the Church to this day obserueth.

This doctrine S. Chrysostome confirmeth with these wordes. *Now the time inuiterh vs to come vnto that dreadful Table with due reuerence, and agreeable watchfulness. Let no Iudas there be found, let no euil disposed person thither come. For it is not man, that of the Cōsecratio of*

Concil.

Trident.

Sess. 22.

cap. 2.

Luc. 22.

Chrysost.

homil. De

produtione

Iuda.



# THE PREFACE TO

our Lordes Table maketh the thinges set forth the body and bloude of Christe. The wordes be uttered with the Priestes mouth, and with the power of God and his grace, they are consecrated. This is my body, saith Christ: with this worde the thinges set forth be consecrated. And as that worde, which saith, Grow ye, and be ye multiplied, and fill the earth, was once spokē, but at al time seeleth his effect, nature working unto generation: Euē so that worde was once spoken, but it geneth strength unto the Sacrifice, through al the Tables of the Church, vntil this day, and vntil his comming. Againē he saith in an other Homilie. I wil tel you further of a maruelous thing, and woonder not at it, let it not trouble you. What is that? The holy Oblation in selfe, be it Peter, be it Paule, or of what so euer merite the Priest be, that offereth it, is the very same, that Christ him selfe gaue vnto his Disciples, and that Priestes now also do consecrate. This hath no whit lesse then that. Why so? Bicause they be not men, that sanctifie this, but Christe which consecrated that before. For as the wordes that Christe spake, be the same, which the Priestes now also do pronounce: so the Oblation is the same. Therefore he saith in an other place:

Cbrysof.  
Homil. 60  
ad popul.  
Aniwoch.

*Ministrorum nos ordinem tenemus, qui verò ipsa sanctificat, & transmutat, ipse est.* We are but in the order of Ministers, but he that sanctifieth the thinges (brought forth) and changeth them (into the body and bloude of Christe) is he him selfe, that is to say, Christe.

Concil.  
Florenti-  
anum.

Hereunto agreeth the Councel of Florence. The Priest (say those learned Fathers) doth consecrate this Sacrament speaking in the person of Christe. in the person of Christe (they meane) sitting, and offering vp him selfe at his Supper. For the Church teacheth not, that the



the woordes of consecration be spoken by way of rehearsal only, and that the body and bloude of Christe is made at euery pronounciation of them, as by a covenant made by Christe with vs. But as the brothers of Ioseph in Egypte, fearing least he would beare in minde the iniuries, which he had suffered at their handes, caused this much to be said vnto him, *Thy Father gaue vs in commaundement before he died, that we should say these vnto thee with his wordes. I beseeche thee to forgere the wicked deepe of thy brothers, the sinne, and malice, which they wrought against thee. And we also on our owne behalfe, pray thee to forgene the seruantes of thy Father this iniquitie.* Euen so the Church, first with the wordes of Christ, recording his commaundement, offereth vp vnto the Father his body and bloud. After that the Priestes in the person of the Church, whose publique ministers they are in this behalfe, adde further their owne duerie of offering with their owne wordes.

Gen. vltia-  
mo.

in vltia-  
mo  
Gen. vltia-  
mo

These thinges being considered, that question is soone answered, that of some is demaunded, where, and in what parte of the Masse, is this most holy Oblation made. For although, from the lesser Canon vnto the Communion, it be with wordes and intention presented vnto the Father, yet forasmuch as the wordes of Christe (as S. Chrysostome speaketh) geue strength vnto the Sacrifice, and they are no where els pronouced: properly and in deede then it is made, when the Priest speaking in the person of Christe, saith, *this is my body, to wit, whiche for you is geuen and broken* (which is added in the Canon of S. Iames, and in S. Ambroses Masse) and, *This is my bloude which is shed for you.* For then doo we

In vvhate  
parte of  
the Masse  
is the ho-  
ly Obla-  
tio made.  
Vide Tho 3.  
part. q. 82.  
art. 4. ad  
primum.  
Hamil. de  
proditi-  
one Iuda.

## THE PREFACE TO

that, which our Lorde commaunded to be done in remembrance of him, saying, *Doo ye this in remembrance of me.* As for the thinges that be spoken before, and after, they are to be referred vnto that time.

For albeit al manner Consecration considered by it selfe, includeth not Oblation, yet considered, as it procedeth of the Priestes Intention to offer vnto God by Consecration it selfe the thing consecrated, bicause vnto God, and vnto the honour of him he consecrateth: it hath the true nature of Oblation, and Sacrifice.

Remem-  
brance  
distinct  
from Sa-  
crifice.

Although therefore our Lorde commaunded vs to doo this in remembrance of him, yet is this Sacrifice a farre other thing, then the remembraunce it selfe, or the praise of God, or thanks geuing: sith that the thing it selfe whiche is commaunded to be made, is in the very woordes of Christe, distincted from the remembrance. For he said not, remember ye this, but; *Doo ye this (or make this) in remembrance of me.* The Sacrifice, and the Oblation ought to be made in the remembrance of Christe, so that the remembrance it selfe is not the Sacrifice, but the vse and ende of the Sacrifice, for whiche it ought to be offered. for by this vnbloudy Sacrifice, a commemoration of the Bloudy Sacrifice, that was offered vpon the Crosse, is made

Aug. lib.  
20. contra  
Faustum.  
cap. 18.

vnto the Father. And so saith S. Augustine: *Christiani peracti Sacrificij memoriam celebrant sacrosancta Oblatione, & participatione corporis & sanguinis Christi.* The Christians doo celebrate the memorie of the Sacrifice already done (vpon the Crosse) by the holy Oblation, and participation of the body and bloude of Christe. Whereof it is evidently gathered also, that Ob-

lation

lation is distincted from Participation, although Participation pertaineth to the perfection and full complement of the Sacrifice.

So here thou hast Reader that, whiche was required in the second place, By whom this holy Sacrifice is offered, to wit, by Christ through the Ministerie of the Priest, and by the Priest in the person of Christ. Where also we ought to ioine the Church withal, because of the vnitie of Christ and the Church: and so we vnderstand the Church also to offer, by the ministerie of the Priest. For so S. Augustine teacheth vs with plaine wordes. *In that Sacrament (saith he) it is shewed vnto the Church, that in that Oblation, which it offereth, it selfe is offered.*

In this sacrifice the Church offereth, and is offered.

August. de Ciuir. Dei. li. 10. cap. 6.

Concerning the third point required by S. Augustine, which was promised to be declared, that is to say, what is the thing that is offered: if we wil admit the godly exposition of the Church, the Prophet teacheth vs what it is, where he saith, *What shal I geue againe vnto our Lorde for al that he hath geuen vnto me? I wil take the Cuppe of our Sauour, and cal vpon the name of our Lorde*, meaning by the Cuppe, his precious blood, that vpon the Crosse was shed for vs, and is the price of our Redemption. Which blood together with the body by vertue of Christes worde in the Euchariste, is made present.

3.  
VVhat is the thing that is offered.  
Psal. 115.

Who refuseth this exposition of the Prophete, if he wil beleue Christe him selfe, who said, *This is my body, which is geuen for you; This is my bloude which is shed for you*, he can not be ignorant, what it is, that is offered in this Sacrifice.

Luc. 22.  
Mat. 26

Whereas then God hath so loued the worlde, that he hath

Iohan. 3:

Rom. 8.  
Esaie. 9.

he hath geuen his onely begotten Sonne, and hath geuen vnto vs with him al thinges (for a Babe is borne to vs, a Sonne is geuen to vs, saith Esaie): the whole merite of Christe, and the price of the Redemption, which he gore vpon the Crosse, is ours. And therefore in this Oblation, the thing offered being the body and bloude of Christe, which as a most sufficient price he gaue vpon the Crosse for Redemption of mankinde, and which of gifte we haue receiued of God: we present and geue vnto God, in the person of Christe, that same true body and bloud, that is to say, Christe him selfe together with that great price and merite, not to purchase a new Redemption, but in commemoration of his death, whereby the redemption is already purchaced, in rendring of thanks for his benefites, in a certaine satisfaction for our sinnes and defectes, and for the temporal paines that be due vnto our sinnes (mortal sinnes and paines eueralting being forgeuen either in Baptisme, or through the Sacrament of Penauance) humbly beseching and asking in the person of Christe, that so it be accepted. In consideration wherof S. Cyprian calleth it *the Passion of our Lorde, that we offer*. And S. Augustine calleth it, *Sacrificium pretij nostri*, the Sacrifice of our Price, wherewith our Raunson is paid.

Cyprian.  
ad Ceci-  
liu. epist.  
3. lib. 2.  
Aug. Con-  
fess. lib. 9.  
cap. 12.

And hereof Reader thou maist conceiue, what answer is to be made vnto them, that moue this question, which to some, though without iust cause, semeth to be of great difficultie: whether the Sacrifices of the olde Testament, the Sacrifice that our Lorde offered at his Supper, the Sacrifice of the Crosse, and that Sacrifice, which is daily made in the Church, whether al these haue



haue a like and the selfe same consideration and being of a Sacrifice (to vter it more plainely in Latine to the learned, in whiche tongue this mater would more aptly be treated) *an uniuocè Sacrificia dicantur*. For although al these doo commonly agree in this, that they professe a supreme excellencie of the Diuine Maiestie, in deede it selfe, and sensibly: yet bicause, it pertaineth to the consideration and nature of a Sacrifice, that after some manner it be satisfactorie, as with whiche satisfaction may in some sorte be made to our Lorde God, partly for sinnes, and for paines due to sinnes, partly for benefites, whiche we haue receiued, or be desirous to receiue: onely the Sacrifice of the Crosse hath the most perfite, and most propre nature, of a Sacrifice, as being that, by which only al the price of Satisfaction is purchafed and paid, and out of whiche al Sacrifices, as also al Sacramentes, as out of their first founteine doo draw, and take their whole force and vertue, and by whiche also onely, it hath ben shewed most fully, as muche as can be done, how great is the excellencie of the Diuine Maiestie, and how great thinges it is conuenient that we doo for the same.

But the Sacrifice of the Aulter, and the Sacrifice of our Lordes Supper, forasmuche as they offer vp the same thing, reteine the propre, true, and after their sort perfite, though very different consideration and nature of a Sacrifice, bicause the hoste is the same that was offred vpo the Crosse. But the Sacrifices of the lawe, be Sacrifices after a comon and vnperfite respect: partly bicause there was litle in them, that was worthy of the Diuine Maiestie, partly bicause, as S. Paule writeth to be Hebrewes, *Hebr. 9.* they were not hable to take away sinnes, nor make a

h man



# THE PREFACE TO

man perfit in conscience : but they that sacrificed, obtained these benefites by faith, which by those sacrifices was declared. Of this diuersitie of these sacrifices spea-  
keth S. Augustine. *lib. 20. Contra Faust. cap. 18. and lib. 1. Contra aduersarium Legis & Prophetarum. cap. 18.* Where thou shalt learne Reader, that al sacrifices haue respect vnto the Crosse, in whiche they haue their perfection, and from whiche they gete vertue, or grace to please God, forasmuche as they stay al vpon that, as also al our thankesgeuing, and prayer, as the same S. Augustine teacheth, writing vpon the 108. Psalme.

*August in  
psal. 108.  
in illu ver.  
su, & ora-  
tio eius si-  
at in pec-  
catum.*

4.  
For wh<sup>o</sup>  
is this Sa-  
crifice  
made.

*Psal. 49.*

Now let vs see for whom Oblation is to be made. For inasmuche as our Lorde hath needs of nothing, but we contrary wise haue neede of him, and depende wholly of him : he receiueth not giftes at our handes, but for our sakes, and we acknowledging this muche, doo offer vnto him, to th' intent to obtaine someth'ing of him. For els to what purpose were it to offer giftes vnto him, who saith, *Si esuriero, non dicam tibi: If I happen to be a hungred, I wil not tel thee of it: for mine is the rounde earth, and al where with it is filled.* For asmuche therefore, as in this Diuine Sacrifice, the same selfe Christe is contained, and is sacrificed vnbloudily, whiche in the Altar of the Crosse once offered vp him selfe bloudily : we may soone see, for whom, I meane, for what persons, and for what causes, it may, or ought to be offered.

For whereas this Sacrifice is instituted to this ende, that the memorie of the bloudy Sacrifice should be celebrated, and the fruite of it through this be applied vnto vs, and for so muche as by his worde, *Doo ye this in remembrance of me*, he made no exception of persons,

persons, nor of causes, for whiche he would offer the bloudy Sacrifice: it foloweth plainely, that the Sacrifice of the Aulter is offered for al in general, for whom lawfully we praye to God in the name of Christe, and for whom Sacrifices in the Lawe, and before the Lawe, were woont to be offered. For for al those Christe hath died. And this onely, and singular Sacrifice succeded in place of al the Sacrifices of the olde lawe, as S. Augustine teacheth, which for diuers causes and persons were offered. For as cōcerning persons, *De ciuit.*  
*he gaue him selfe (as saith S. Paule) a redemption for al men. Dei. 11. 17.*

And as touching things to be looked for at Gods hande, *cap. 20.*  
*he that hath not spared his owne Sōne (saith the same . Tim. 2.*  
*Apōstle) but hath deliuered him vp for vs al, how hath he not Rom. 8.*  
*geue to vs also with him al thinges? How hath he not geue,*  
*I say, in asmuche as for his sake he hath proponed al*  
*thinges by him to be obtained? For what so euer (saith*  
*he) ye aske of my Father in my name, he will geue it you. Ioan. 16.*

Wherefore sith that he commaunded this Sacrifice to be offered in remembrance of him, and nothing is more effectual to the obtaining of any thing by the Passion of Christe, then with thankful commemoration to this ende to celebrate the memorie of the same before the Father: what is there wherevnto the Death of Christe is auailable, that may not through this Sacrifice be most profitably asked, in whiche he him selfe that hath died, is presented?

Therefore wee read, that the holy Fathers, whiche were before the lawe, and in the time of the lawe, did not offer vp Sacrifice only for thanksgewing, and in recognition of the diuine Maiesty, but also for sinnes, and for

For what  
 causes  
 were Sa-  
 crifices of-  
 fered by  
 the Fas-  
 ters, be-  
 fore the  
 lawe, and  
 in the lawe.

# THE PREFACE TO

Iob. 1. &  
ult.

what soever their necessities, and needs, as the Scripture recordeth of holy Iob, and his frendes, of Aaron, Samuel, David, the Machabees, and Onias the Priest. So also in the lawe there were offered, not only Peaceofferings, called, *pacifica*, or whole burnt offerings, which were offered for thankesgeuing, and for thobteining of Gods blessings: but also Sacrifices for sinnes; yea and after the diuersitie of sinnes, diuers Sacrifices were instituted. Wherefore they offered not only for those, whom they accompted for iuste, but also for sinners, strangers, and infidels, for the quicke, and the Dead.

Sacrifice  
offered  
for the  
vvhole  
vvorlde.  
Gen. 8.

Neither did they sacrifice alwaies for one alone, but also for the whole people, yea and for the whole worlde. For it semeth that the Sacrifice of Noe, whereof we read in Genesis, was offered for al mankinde. Noe builded an Altar to our Lorde (saith the Scripture), and taking some of al the cleane beastes, and birdes, he offered burnt Sacrifices vpon the Altar, and our Lorde smelled the swete saour, and saith vnto him, I wil no more curse the earth for mennes cause, for the sense and thought of mannes harte are prone to euil from their youth, wherefore I wil no more strike euery lyuing soule, as I haue done.

Mach. 3

As touching that whiche was offered in the lawe, on the morne and euen euery day, it was for the whole people, and for their common necessities: whereof we read Numer. 28. Onias the chiefe Priest offered vp an healthful hoste for Heliodorus an infidel, and a most wicked man. And the Iewes that were carried away captiue to Babylon, sent money to Ierusalem, wherewith they that remained there, should buy whole burnt offerings, and incense, and make ye manna (quod they) and offer

Barn. 1.

offer ye for sinne at the Altier of our Lorde our God, and pray ye for the life of Nabugodonosor king of Babylon, and for the life of Baltazar his sonne, that their daies may be as the daies of heauen upon earth, as we finde in Baruch. Furthermore Iudas that valiant Captaine of the Machabees, sent a great summe of money to Ierusalem, and commaunded sacrifice to be made for the finnes of the dead, whom he hoped to haue died in godly estate.

2. Machab.  
12.

Now Reader, I trowe that we, to whom a Sacrifice hath ben leaste by our Sauour Christe of so muche a more excellencie, by how muche the body of the Sonne of God, is worthier then an vnreasonable beast, are, not in this behalfe in worse case, then the Iewes were, but that the same may also for vs be profitable and auailable to al persons, to al causes, and to al necessities. This much we finde taught by S. Augustine, *Chrysost.* *Epist. 59.* By S. Chrysostom also, and by the dayly practise of the Church, whiche in the Masse praieth alwaies for the whole worlde, as the Masse also of S. Iames hath expressely.

*Hom. 6.*  
*in. 1. Tim.*  
*2. & li. 6.*  
*de Sacer-*  
*dotio.*

But whereas a thing, that is good and profitable, is said to profite others by moe waies then one, as for example, either *ex opere operato*, as the Scholastical Doctors speake, (as muche to say, of the force, power, and strength of the thing or worke it selfe, which is done or wrought, without respect had vnto the worthines, or merite of the partie that doth or worketh, as the Sacramentes are said to worke *ex opere operato*, and to doo that thing, for whiche they be adhibited vnto a person accordingly disposed, by force and vertue of the worke that is wrought, euen as a man that putteth fier

After  
what way  
is this sa-  
crifice as  
uailable.

h. iij

vnto



## THE PREFACE TO

unto a house, is said to set the house a fire *ex opere operato*, by force of that very worke done): or *ex opere operantis*, asmuche to say, by the deuotion, vertue, and goodnes of the partie that worketh, as prayer, fasting, almosse, and the like: Or els, by way of merite, or satisfaction, whiche doo claime a certaine right: or lastly, by way of humble prayer, whiche hathe hope in benigntie onely and liberalitie of him to whom prayer is made: whereas, I say, a thing which is good and profitable, may be said to profite by so many sundry waies: Here there ariseth no smal difficultie to discusse, by which of these meanes and waies, the Sacrifice of the Masse is auailable to them, for whom it is offered: and whereof it commeth to passe, that it profiteth one more then an other.

To this question hauing consulted the writings of learned and graue men, thus I answer: that bicause in the Masse many thinges doo concurre and meete together, it is auailable by al meanes and waies, by whiche a good worke may be auailable: but yet that for the diuersitie of causes, and persons, for whiche the Sacrifice is offered, it hath diuers working. And generally, albeit of it selfe, or (*ex opere operato*) by vertue of the thing offered and sacrificed, it be auailable: yet not altogether after the same manner, that Sacramentes be. For as touching the Sacramentes, they be as instruments that God useth in them to whom they be adhibited, and if they be disposed as they ought to be, and through faith and charitie be capable, they worke health and saluation, and conferre grace. But the Sacrifice of the Masse (as the nature of a Sacrifice requireth) doth

Sacramentes, and Sacrifices diuers in the manner of vsors King.



doth worke after a manner, whiche, though it be of more efficacie, yet is like vnto prayer. Of more efficacie, I say, forasmuche as it is made in the person of Christe, a most acceptable, and most sufficient gifte being geuen and offered vp, for whose sake God being appeased and pleased, is moued to heare them, that so to him doo sue and pray. Neither is it to be doubted, but that thinsitution of Christe is muche auailable to encrease the power, which this sacrifice hath to obtaine thinges behooful for mans health. For he woulde neuer haue deliuered him selfe vnto vs, to thintent we should offer him with our owne handes vnto his eternal Father: except he had forseene and willed, that great commoditie should redounde too men by this Oblation.

In consideration whereof, bicause it worketh an effecte like vnto prayer, the Scripture vnder the name of prayer, oftentimes comprehendeth both Sacrifice in general, and also this Sacrifice specially succeeding in place of al the olde Sacrifices, as though Sacrifice it selfe also were a certaine prayer, but a singular prayer. So the writer of the storie of the Machabees hauing made a rehearsal of the Sacrifice of Iudas, that he commaunded to be offred for them that were dead, bringeth in a general sentence, saying, *It is therefore a holy and a holesom thought, to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sinnes*, signifying sacrifice to be contained vnder prayer, as the Special is contained vnder the General.

And S. Paule expounding the definition of Christe as he is a Priest whose duetie is to offer vp giftes, and Sacrifices, saith, *that he in the daies of his flesh* (asmuche to

Sacrifice  
compre-  
hended  
vnder the  
name of  
prayer

2. Ma-  
chab. 12.

Heb. 5.

say,

## THE PREFACE TO

say, when he was conuerfant here among men) offering up prayers and supplications to him that was able to saue him from death with strong crying, and with teares, was heard for his reuerence. Where manifestly he calleth giftes and sacrifices by the name of prayers. So S. Augustine in his .59. Epistle taketh *Orationes*, that is to say, Prayers in S. Paule. *1. Tim. 2.* for Oblations and Sacrifices. So in the Actes, *Cap. 6. Nos orationi, & ministerio Verbi instantes erimus.* We wil attende diligently to Prayer, and to the ministerie of the Worde. So whereas it is said of  
*Leuit. 16.* the Priest in the booke of Leuiticus, *Orabis pro se*, he  
*Heb. 5.* shal pray for him selfe, S. Paule in the Epistle to the Hebrewes interpreteth it, *offeret pro se ipso*, he shal offer for him selfe.

So where it is said in Esaie, *Domus mea domus orationis vocabitur*, My House shalbe called the House of  
*Esaie. 56.* prayer, it is not without cause iudged, that vnder the  
*Mat. 21.* name of prayer, the Prophete comprehendeth Sacrifice. For the Temple was not appointed vnto prayer specially, and properly, but vnto Oblation and Sacrifice. For prayer might be made in euery place, but Sacrifice could be made no where but in the Temple. In deede prayer was euermore added vnto the Sacrifices, wherewith they asked that of God, for which they offered. Yet say we not that sacrifice is prayer, as the name of prayer is taken properly, but that oftentimes it is vnderstanded by the name of prayer, bicause in this it is like vnto it, for that it offereth a gifte vnto God, to thintent to receiue some thing of him, wherein it appeareth to be a prayer, not in worde, but in deede. And bicause it geueth to receiue, it hath also the nature of a certaine satisfaction,  
as that

as that which geueth one thing for an other.

The sacrifice then of the Masse, is auailable, *ex opere operato*, that is to say, in respecte of the vertue and strength of the thing it selfe that is offred. of the thing it selfe I meane, without consideration had of the priest, whether he be good, or euil, bicause in the person of Christe, and by his commission, the body and bloude of Christe are offered vp vnto God. Whiche oblation it selfe for the worthines, and reuerence of Christe, as a Prayer of greatest efficacie, and moſte worthy to be heard, the Father beholdeth, and in regard of it, performeth that, for whiche the body and bloude of his Sonne are so offred, according to the order of his Diuine disposition, and as it shal seme conuenient to him selfe, forasmuche as al iudgement is geuen vnto him.

The Sacrifice a  
uailable  
*ex opere  
operato*  
in vvh  
respects.

Iohan. 5.

By the same consideration it hath very great force and strength to satisfie for temporal paines that be due vnto finnes, whiche paines oftentimes in Scripture be called by the name of finnes. For if according vnto the counsel of Daniel, finnes, that is to say, paines due to finnes, are redemed with almoses, how much more with the body and bloude of the Sonne of God offered at the Altar? If paines were loosed by the sacrifices of the olde Lawe, shal they not much more be loosed by the Sacrifice of the newe Lawe? For els, what shal we say, that the bloude of Christe is of lesse price in the sight of God, then the bloude of a calfe? Although Sacrifices haue their valour by way of Prayer, yet when they bring a present that is worthy of Gods fauour to remission of paines, and of his giftes, they leane to a certaine right and equitie, as the Price being exhibited, and so they

The Sac  
crifice sa  
tisfieth  
for paines

Daniel. 4.

# THE PREFACE TO

they be satisfactorie.

August.  
contra liti-  
ras Petili-  
api. lib. 2  
cap. 54.

S. Augustine speaking of this way of working by the name of Christe, in sacrifices, and otherwise, saith to Petilian the Donatist, *Gratias Deo, quia tandem confessus es ualere inuocatū nomen Christi ad aliorum salutē, etiā si a peccatoribus inuocetur.* God be thanked, for that thou hast at length confessed, that the name of Christe called vpon is auailable vnto the health of others, although it be called vpon of sinners. If the name of Christe onely called vpon be auailable vnto health, shal not the bloud of Christ be auailable to procurement of health, specially if the person, for whom it is offered, be through his owne good disposition meete to receiue suche benefite?

The Sa-  
crifice A  
uailable  
ex opere  
operantis.

Neither is this Sacrifice auailable onely ( *ex opere operato* ) of it selfe, and of the worke done, but also in some degree, *ex opere operantis*, for, and through the merite of the offerer. For inasmuch as the Priest doth offer this holy Sacrifice not as a priuate man, and in his owne priuate name, but as the publike Minister of the Church, and in the name of the Church, assumed therunto by publike auctoritie: whereas there neuer want great merites in the Church, the merite of the offerer is neuer separated from the vertue of the worke that is wrought, that is to say, from the body and bloud of Christe: so that although the Priest that offereth, and they that be present, be wicked, yet the Sacrifice of the Masse is not void and frustrat, but much auailable to the working of some good effect; according to the disposition of Gods merciful prouidence.

August.  
cōt. epist.  
Piermen.  
lib. 2.

And therefore no maruel is it, after the teaching of S. Augustin, that good wordes which be said in the publike

Praiers.



Praiers for the people, though they be said of euil Bishops, neuerthelesse be heard, not according to the peruerstie of the Gouvernours, but according to the deuotion of the people. And yet it skilleth muche what the Gouvernours be, seing that their godlines through the Sacrifice much helpeth the infirmirie of the people. For which cōsideration, as S. Cyprian saith, *We ought not to electe any other to be Bishops, but suche as be unspotted, and whole, who offering up Sacrifices vnto God worthily and holily, may be heard in their Prayers, which they make for the safetie of our Lordes people.* For els, *when he that is sent to make intercession, displeaseth the mind of the displeased is more greuously provoked,* saith S. Gregorie speaking of vnworthy Priestes.

But yet the Priestes impietie can not let, but that the Sacrifice, whiche of it selfe, and being offred in the name of the Church, is so good and acceptable a thing vnto God, shal profite them, whiche besides the Priestes with godlines doo offer it, according to the deuotion borhe of them, that with the Priestes doo offer, and of them, for whom it is offred. For true it is that S. Augustin saith to *Petilianus* the Donatiste: *Nos dicimus tale cuiq; Sacrificiū fieri, qualis accedit ut offerat.* We say, that the Sacrifice to eche man is made suche, as he is, that commeth to offer.

Whereas then the wel disposed people doth offer vp that same very Sacrifice by deuoute affection, whiche the Priest offereth by outward Ministerie: the wickednes of the Minister bereueth not any deuoute person of the benefite of the Sacrifice.

Neither is this so to be taken, as though in this case nothing were to be looked for aboue the merite of our deuotion, for then to what purpose were the Sacrifice?

But

Cyprian.  
lib. 1. epist.

Gregor in  
Pastorali  
part. 1. ca.

2.  
The impi-  
etic of the  
Priest is  
no hinde-  
rance to  
others  
touching  
the bene-  
fite of the  
Sacrifice

August.  
contra  
lit. Petil.  
lib. 2. c. 52  
1. q. 1. cap.  
Dominus.



## THE PREFACE TO

But what so euer benefite redoundeth of the vertue of the Sacrifice, ouer and aboute the merite of deuotion: the same is so muche the more abundantly of euery one enioyed, with how muche more deuotion towardes Christe and his Death he offereth.

This deuoute disposition of the offerers our Lorde prescribed, when consecrating and making his Apostles Priestes, he said, *Doo ye this in remembrance of me.* In whiche commaundement, whereas there be two thinges conteined, dooing, and remembring, or commemoration: this muche our Lorde therein signified, that with how muche the more grateful and deuoute memorie they did it, so muche the more by this Sacrifice they should obtaine: and againe how muche the nearer any man came vnto that dooing, and action of offering, the more benefite thereof he should receiue. For though al they that be iuste may be said to offer this Sacrifice by a certaine generalitie, which S. Augustin semeth to meane, for so muche as it pleaseth them al, that it be offered: yet they come nearer vnto this action, who doo it them selues, who heare Masse deuoutely, who serue and attend vpon the Priest to doo that actiō, who susteine him for his ministerie, who with godly desire require Masse of him.

Wherefore as a prayer profiteth them that pray themselves more, then an other, for whom it is made: so this Sacrifice profiteth more them, that offer it them selues, then it doth them, for whom only it is offered. And as a Prayer profiteth more, that is specially made for one, then that whiche is made onely in general for al: euen so it is in the Sacrifice. But these thinges shal appeare more clearly

*Luc. 22.  
1. Cor. 11.*

*The Sa-  
crifice  
profiteth  
in diuers  
degrees.*

*August.  
Epist. 23.*

clearly by the effectes, whiche we looke for to enjoye, by the Sacrifice of the Masse through the vertue of Christes passion, if we reherse them particularly.

The first effecte by consent of al men is the remission of Venial finnes, which the very iuste doo daily commit, and also of temporal paines, vnto whiche they remaine thral and bounde, though damnation euerlasting be foregeuen.

9.  
The effectes that we obtaine by the Sacrifice of the Masse.

An other effecte is, the increase of righteousnes, and the continuance in good life. These are expressly declared in the Institution of this Sacrifice by the Institutor him selfe, who first offered it. *This is my bloude* (saith he) *of the new Testament, which for you, and for many is shed in remission of finnes.* That the Apostles vnderstood the very same also in the Consecration of the Body, the Masse of S. Iames doth shewe. Where after the pronouncing of those wordes, *this is my body which for you is geuen, and broken:* the Deacon forthwith addeth, *in remissionem peccatorum, in remission of finnes.* By whiche wordes, forso-muche as with them Christ to this effecte offered him selfe, (albe it peraduenture they might be more generally vnderstanded) that at least may be gathered, which now we haue said of the remission of Venial finnes, and temporal paines, vnto whiche the Apostles them selues were thral.

<sup>a</sup>Luc. 22.  
<sup>b</sup>Mat. 26

*liturgia Iacobi.*

Touching the other, there is a manifest place in S. Iohn. Christe speaking of the Apostles, and of them that should through their preaching beleue in him, saith: *For them I sanctifie my selfe, that they also may be sanctified in truth.* Whiche saying is truly vnderstanded of the increase of holynesse, and of continuance, in asmuche as

*Iohan. 17.*

## THE PREFACE TO

the Apostles were now cleaused, and sanctified.

And vnto these effectes the Sacrifice of the Masse is auailable for al the faithfull that pertaine to the body of Christe, that is to say, for the iuste, not only by the deuotion and merite of men that offer it, but by the vertue of the Sacrifice it selfe: neither onely by meane of a certaine common Prayer, whiche standeth vpon liberalitie, but of suche prayer, as satisfieth the requestes of Gods iustice with presenting vnto him the price paid for sinnes, and with a giste geuen worthy to obteine that is asked, whiche is the proper nature of a Sacrifice, which is to be satisfactorie, and to be offered by way of satisfaction. And therefore S. Paule specially considering the worthines of this true Sacrifice, said in general, that *euery Bishop or Priest is ordained to offer giftes and Sacrifices for sinnes.*

Of this it is learnedly by the Diuines gathered, that, for so muche as Infidels, and suche wicked persons, as be not yet reconciled vnto the Church, or vnto God, nor so disposed, that for them satisfaction may effectually be made: Sacrifice for them is not properly offered. For whether they them selues, or others for them doo offer, God doth not accepte giftes for the wicked, to this ende for whiche properly they be offered, as it appeared in Cain. This is witnessed in the Scriptures, and in sundry other places.

Gen. 4.  
Prouer. 15  
Eccles. 34

August. de  
origine  
anima.  
lib. 1. c. 9.

Therefore S. Augustine saith writing to Renatus, *Quis offerat Corpus Christi, nisi praeis, qui membra sunt Christi?* Who may offer the body of Christe, but for them, whiche are the members of Christe? The late holy general Council of Trent approving this sentence of S.

of S. Augustine, and declaring that the Masses, whereat  
 no man communiceth besides the Priest, be not pri-  
 uate, but common, saith, that they ought to be iudged  
 common, partly for that the people in them doth communi-  
 cate spiritually, partly for that they be celebrated by the  
 publique Minister of the Church, not for him selfe onely,  
 but for al the Faithful, that pertaine to the Body of  
 Christe.

Masses  
 common  
 not pri-  
 uate, and  
 wherfore  
 the Con-  
 cil.  
 Trident.  
 Sess. 22.  
 cap. 6.

When therefore Petrus à Soto that learned man  
 was demaunded in that Councel, whether Chaunter-  
 ies might be erected, and Masses appointed to be said  
 for Infidels: he answered, that it was vnlawful, bicause  
 to ordeine Masse for any, is to ordeine, that Sacri-  
 fice for them be offered, and that to them thereby sa-  
 tisfaction be applied, whiche ought not to be done,  
 bicause satisfaction requireth before a remission of the  
 deadly fault. Yet wel may it be, (said he) that Prayer in  
 the Masse for their Conuerfion be made.

Our Sauour him selfe semeth to haue insinuated  
 this propertie of the Oblation, when offering vp his  
 body and bloude at the Supper after the fourme and  
 rite of Melchisedek, not without cause he said, of the  
 one, *Whiche for you is geuen*, of the other, *Whiche for*  
*you, and for many is shed* (that is to say, is presently offe-  
 red vp and shed in Mysterie, anonne with outward vio-  
 lence to be shed) *in remission of sinnes*: For as touching  
 the valour of the price, it was offered vpon the Crosse,  
 not for many, but for al. And so the Sacrifice of  
 Melchisedek obtained the benediction for iuste Abra-  
 ham, who is the example and paterne of al that folow  
 him.

Luce. 22.  
 Math. 26.

This



## THE PREFACE TO

*Ecclesiast.*  
*Hierarch.*  
*c. 3 part. 5.* This iudge I to be the chiefe cause why in the Primi-  
tiue Church, as we finde in S. Dionysius the Areopa-  
gite, when true discipline was exactly kept, the learners  
of the faith before they receiued Baptisme, then called  
*Catechumeni*, they that were possessed of vncleane spi-  
rites, called *Energumeni*, Publique Sinners, and they that  
did publique penance, were commaunded by the Dea-  
con to departe out of the Church before the Obla-  
tion, that they should not be present at it.

Yet as it is here before said, and as it is cleare by S.  
1. Tim. 2. Paul, in a certaine general and comon respecte we offer  
for al, forasmuche as we present the body and bloude of  
Christe vnto the Father in his person, and by his com-  
mission, and beseeche his goodnes, that in regarde of his  
body and bloude he wil haue mercie vpon them. But  
we doo not presente these giftes for al, as a Price that  
is exhibited for them (whiche thing the propre nature of  
this oblation comprehendeth in respecte of release of  
the paines) bicause al be not capable, that is to say, not  
apte vessels to receiue suche benefite.

Benefites  
redoun-  
ding to  
vs by the  
Masse.

As touching other thinges, whiche profitably be  
asked in the Masse, as victorie, peace, health, reasonable  
wether, and such other the like, wherewith mannes mi-  
serie is releued and holpen, the Sacrifice of the Masse  
is auailable for them, according to the order of Gods  
eternal disposition, not onely by reason of the merite  
of the Priest, and of the Church that offereth: but also,  
and that more amply, by reason of the qualitie, and ver-  
tue of the Sacrifice, whiche is consecrated in the person  
of Christe, and by his commission.

But this is by way of Prayer: whiche Prayer, bicause it  
is not



is not fitting the wordes of Christe to be frustrate, by  
 whiche he committed this Sacrifice vnto vs: the Father  
 very oftentimes heareth. And whereas he heareth it  
 not, the iudgementes of God be secrete. For great is  
 the vertue of the signes, and Sacramentes of the name  
 of Iesus Christe, vnto whose honour the very powers  
 of the Aier are commaunded to yelde and geue place,  
 though it be called vppon by euil, and for euil persons,  
 as S. Augustine very learnedly teacheth in his booke *Aug. lib.*  
 of .83. questions, or who els so euer is author of that *83. quest.*  
 booke. For in no wise dare any sprites (saith he) to con- *quest. 79.*  
 temne these signes. For they tremble at these, where so  
 euer they beholde them. but men being unwitting of it, by  
 God an other thing sometime is commaunded. For where as  
 they geue not place vnto these signes, God him selfe forbid-  
 deth, when he iudgerh it iuste, and profitable. Thus S.  
 Augustine.

To this very aptly serueth that he writeth in his .22.  
 booke *De Ciuitate Dei*. Where he telleth of a house de-  
 liuered from euil Sprites by the Prayers, and Sacrifice of  
 the Masse. *Hesperius a noble mā* (saith he) who dwelleth in *August. de*  
 our countrie, hath in the Lordship of Fußala, a Ferme, cal- *Ciuit. Dei*  
 led Cubedi. Where when he understoode, that his house *lib. 22. c. 8.*  
 which he hath there, sustained great hurte by euil Sprites,  
 and that his catall, and his Seruantes were much troubled:  
 he besought our Priestes in my absence, that one would go  
 thither, that by his Prayers they might be driuen away. One  
 went, and offered up there the Sacrifice of the body of  
 Christe, praying, as muche as he was able, that the  
 vexation might cease. Forthwith by the mercie of God  
 it ceased.

# THE PREFACE TO

Grego. in  
Dialogis.

S. Gregorie sheweth by many examples, that through the Sacrifice of the Masse diuers receiued temporal benefites, who neither were present when Masse was said for them, nor thought at al of it. Also certaine special helpes by this Sacrifice be obtained, which of the Diuines are called, *prima gratia*; for with these God doth oftentimes helpe them, for whom the Sacrifice is offered, that the motion of faith, and deuotion, and desire of the medicine of the Sacramentes, be stirred vp in them.

Thus thou seest Reader, what power the Sacrifice of the Masse hath. And as this Sacrifice hath vertue to remoue al manner euils from vs, so it hath vertue to get and procure al good thinges vnto vs, according to the disposition of Gods Prouidence. Wherefore that also may easily be conceiued, which of many men is called in question touching the remission of mortal finnes. Vnrely the blessed Martyr S. Alexander fifth in the Register of the Popes, saith in his firste epistle, that *Crimes, and finnes be put out by these Sacrifices offered vp vnto our Lorde.* And againe, that *our Lorde is delited, and appeased with such Sacrifices, and that (through them) he forgue the great finnes.* For nothing (saith he) can be greater in Sacrifices, then the body and bloud of our Lorde.

What  
force the  
Sacrifice  
of the  
Masse  
hath touch-  
ing the  
remission  
of mortal  
finnes.

Alexan-  
der epist.  
ad vñ or-  
thodoxos.

Julius.  
De Conf.  
Distinct. 2.  
Cñ omne.  
Gregor.  
Dialog. 4.  
Cap. 58.

Iulius speaking likewise of the Sacrifices, saith, that by them offered to God, al crime and sinne is quite put out. S. Gregorie also saith, that *this Sacrifice singularly saue the soule from euerlasting destruction.* Al whiche, and sundry other the like sayinges of certaine Fathers, are so to be vnderstanded, not as though we might obtaine remission of such finnes after Baptisme committed without Absolution of the Priest, who is the Ministre of the Sa-

crament

erament of Penance: but that this blessed Sacrifice doth geue such grace, and worketh so together with the infirmities of the Penitentes, that they may by the Priests be reconciled vnto God. And it is so acceptable in the sight of God, that (as the Councel of Trent teacheth) *being appeased by the Oblation of it, graunting grace, and the giste of Penance, he forgueth Crimes, and sinnes, yea that be right great.* Sefs. 22.  
Cap. 2.

As concerning them, that with godlinesse are departed this life and haue taken their slepe, as the Scripture speaketh, and haue not, as it behooued them, made full satisfaction, whom we beleue to remaine in Purgatorie: although now they be not in state to merite any thing by any operatiō of their owne wil, or to do holesom Penance for their sinnes: yet bicause they be the members of Christ, and felow citizens withal the Saintes, felowes, and brothers with them: the Sacrifice of the Masse profiteth them as it doth the other iuste persons here, but that their owne propre deuotiō cā helpe them nothing, as now depending wholly of Christ, and of the Church. For although *God in the day of our departure hence* (as it is said of the wise man) *do rendre to every man according to his waies:* yet after the doctrine of S. Augustin this much by their good workes they haue deserued at Gods hand whiles they lyued here: that these common duties of Christian fellowship might profit them also after their departure hence. For els it should seme very vniuste, and injurious vnto the body of Christe, if there were any members of it, to which being in distresse it could not procure succour. The motion of contrition and charity, with whiche they departed hence (for els they

The Sacrifice of the Masse profitable for the dead.  
2. Mac. 12  
Ioan. 11.  
August. in Enchirid.  
cap. 110.

Eccle. 11.  
August. in Enchirid.  
ad Laureti, cap. 110

## THE PREFACE TO

*Athanas.  
in quest.  
ad Antio-  
chū. q. 34.  
Chrysost.  
ad pop.  
Antioch.  
Homil. 69  
& Sermo.  
3. in epist.  
ad Philip.  
Damasc. in  
Oratione.  
de ijs qui  
binc in fi-  
de migra-  
runt.*

remain not in Purgatorie ) is a disposition, whiche may suffice in their behalfe; that Sacrifices, and other godly workes, offered and done for them, may helpe them. Wherefore as S. Athanasius, S. Chrysostom, Damascen, and the more parte of the auncient Fathers doo witness, it descended by Tradition from the Apostles, that this vnbloudy Sacrifice be continually offered for them.

Now then Christian Reader thou hast here declared vnto thee, those pointes, that I promised in the beginning: what is Sacrifice; being considered either as it is taken for the Action of offering, or for the gifts offered: for what consideration it is due vnto God: that it is most conuenient for our nature that it be visible: that the rite of sacrificing hath ben by God bothe engrafted in the mindes of men before the Lawe, and commanded in the Lawe: That for loue of his Church: our Lorde Instituted the singular Sacrifice of his body and bloude at his last Supper: How those foure thinges be in this singular Sacrifice, whiche S. Augustine teacheth to be required in euery Sacrifice: lastly, for whom this Sacrifice is offered: by what waies it is auailable for man: what effectes it bringeth forth.

*The Prai-  
ers of the  
Masse  
godly,  
and with  
out super-  
stition.*

Some here perhaps do wish, that I said somewhat in defence of the Prayers, that be commonly said in the Masse about the Oblation of this vnbloudy Sacrifice, and of the Ceremonies, whiche the Church vseth in the celebration of the same: for our Adversaries by diuers waies labour to bring them in contempt. As touching the Canon of the Masse, what parte of it M. Iewel reproveth as blasphemous: in this Reiondre I

doe



doo sufficiently defend, as godly and holy; and such as may worthily seme meete to be said at the celebratiō of these Mysteries. As for al the rest that is said, for so much as therein, as S. Ambrose saith, *Praise is deferred to God, prayer is made for the people, for Kings, and for al men, and for al our necessities*: briefly, fith nothing is done, but that which S. Paule exhorteth to be done in his epistle to Timothe, whereof we spake before: what is there that M. Iewel, or any of that side, or Sathan him- selfe the great enemie of this Sacrifice, can finde fault withal? Pag. 123.  
Item  
pag. 254.  
b. c. 1.  
Ambro. de  
Sacramēt.  
lib. 4. c. 4.  
1. Tim. 2.

Concerning the Ceremonies vsed in the Masse, which consiste in the behaviour, Gestures, Mouinges, and Signes of the Priest, whereat also these men beare great spite: they be void of superstition, and free from al iuste reproche, bicause they be onely such, as put vs in minde of some special-thing touching the Incarnation, Birth, Life, Preaching, Death, and Resurrection of Christe, which pertaineth to the stirring vp of Deuotion, and to the commaundement of Christe the more conueniently to be obserued. For whereas he commaunded vs, that what he did, we should doo the same: it may reasonably seeme to be our duetie, that as he did, and after what manner he did, we also doo likewise. Verily the Ceremonies which we vse, be of more antiquitie, represent thinges of more excellēcie, and through the practise of the whole Church of Christe be of more auctoritie: then that by the doctrine of any new Gospel, it may now towarde the time of Antichriste, seeme either necessarie, or conuenient, that they be changed. Ceremo-  
nies vsed  
in the ce-  
lebration  
of the  
Masse.  
  
Luc. 22.

And to thintent these ouerthrowers of al auncient



## THE PREFACE TO

Religion, and setters vp of their owne Nouelties, haue ceremonies in lesse contempt: let vs consider, whether Christe him selfe (who first of al celebrated Masse  
**1. Tim. 2.** at his last Supper, and did those things, which S. Paule requiteth in his epistle to Timothee) obserued not certaine Ceremonies, muche like to ours. He layd downe his garment, he girded him selfe, he kneeled or stooped downe, he washed his Disciples feete, he gaue thanks to his Father, he consecrated and offered vp vnto him his Body and Bloude, he spake vnto his Disciples, he admonished, he taught, he comforted them, he lifted vp his eyes vnto heauen, he prayed vnto the Father for them, and for vs.

Ceremonies  
 used  
 by our  
 Saviour  
 him selfe.  
*Iohan. 17.*

**1. Cor. 11.** S. Paule straitly forbiddeth, a man to pray, or propheticie in the Church, with couered head. If the Catholikes, without expresse Scripture, though moued with the like reason that moued S. Paule, had so ordeined: these men would haue cried out, that it had bene superstitious. Touching this mater, here to speake of al, it were very long, and a thing meete for a special booke to be written thereof, rather then for the breuitie of a Preface. Therefore I let passe much that might wel be recited out of S. Dionyse the Areopagite, S. Iustine the Martyr, Tertullian, Innocentius the firste, and others, that of these thinges haue written.

Howe  
 Ceremonies  
 may be  
 used with  
 out superstitiō.

Certaine it is, that the Ceremonies we vse be not superstitious. For that we iudge to be superstitious, whiche being vsed in place of Gods seruice, pertaineth not to the worship of God, nor to the loue of our neighbour. And whereas the worship of God is double

is double, for so much as we haue from him both the inward, and the outward good thinges: then is it due-ly, and lawfully, and without al superstition done, when the outwarde thinges by some publique aucto-ritie, as from God ( for al power is of God ) or by a certaine leading of nature be ordeined vnto an inward reuerence, and a duetiful kindnes towardes God to be stirred vp, nourished, and continued. *For the mo- uing it selfe of the soule ( as saith S. Augustine ) so long as it is yet lapped within earthly thinges, is but slowly in- flamed, but if it be carried vnto bodily likenesses, and thence be carried vnto the spiritual thinges, that by those likenesses be figured: with the passing it selfe as it were (from the one to the other) it is quickened, and being stir- red as fyre in a fyrebrande, it is enkindled, and with a more ardent loue it is pulled vnto her rest and quiet. There- fore the vse of comely Ceremonies moueth the minde more, then if the thinges by them signified were vt- tered naked, and without similitudes of Sacramentes, as there also he saith.*

August. ad  
Iauuar.  
epist. 119.

And this is the meaning of al the outward Rites, that be obserued in the Masse. As for example, the Priestes Vestimentes, doo signifie either the garmentes of Christe, with which he was mockt, either the new condition of the new man, or the Incarnation of the new King: His comming vnto the Aulter, betokeneth Christes appearing, whiche was receiued with great ioye, and singing of Angels: the going from the one side of the Aulter to the other, sheweth the translation of the Gospel vnto the Gétiles, and the returning of it vnto

The mean-  
ing of  
the Ceres-  
monies  
vsed in  
the cele-  
bration  
of the  
Masse.  
Matth. 27  
Luc. 2.

the

the Iewes: by the washing of handes, the Priestes cleanness of life, by his bowing downe, humilitie, by stretching of his Armes abroad, the Crosse, by his making of many signes of the Crosse, euery good effecte to procede of the merite of the Crosse, is signified. The like may be conceiued of such others moe. For certainly as wordes be signes of thinges, so be these Rites in the blessed Masse, signes of great Mysteries.

To be shorte, bicause through the infirmitie of our condition, humane affection for the most parte little esteemeth common thinges, and such as be not distincte from other thinges by some token of a more excellencie, yea rather dispiseth them (as Malachie the Prophet complained of the vncleane, contemptible, and vile Oblations of his time) and woundereth and reuerenceth those thinges, that by some shewe of excellencie seme to surmount others: it was necessarie for the reuerence of so holy an Oblation, and of the worship, of so great a Maiestie, that peculiar places, as Churches, Tabernacles, Altars also consecrated, as we finde in S. Dionysius, special, and not common Vessels, and peculiar Ministers were appointed for the same, whereby the colde myndes of men might be brought to thinke more reuerently thereof.

*Ecclesiast.  
Hierarch.  
cap. 5. p. 1*

As touching the practise of the Church, that is to say, of the holy and learned Priestes, and of all the people of God from the Apostles time to these dayes, what the Auncient Fathers haue written in prouide, and confirmation of the Sacrifice of the body and bloud of Christ, which hereto might be added: for al this, I referre the Reader vnto my Reioindre.

Now

Now then to cōclude: Sith that it is our duety to geue and offer vnto God some gifte and Sacrifice, whereby to rendre vnto him due thanks for his benefites, and to recognise him for our Creator, and Redemer, and nothing we haue to geue either in it selfe better, or to him more acceptable, then the body and bloude of his Sonne Iesus Christe, and whereas we haue commaundement to offer the same, and so great profite cometh to men thereof, and whereas in the Masse, in whiche this Sacrifice is offered by Christe, and the Church, godly prayers be made for Kinges, for them that be in auctoritie, and for al men, thanks be geuen, certaine outward signes are shewed, whereby the memorie of Christes Passiō is stirred vp and to vs renewed, and reuerence to Godward is enkindled: what forbiddeth, why on the behalfe of the most blessed Masse, and of them who susteine persecution for this Sacrifice, I may not here vtter the woordes of the Holy Patriarke Iacob, by way of expostulation with our Aduersaries, *Quam ob culpam nostram, & ob quod peccatum, quod in Missa committimus, sic exarsitis post nos, & scrutati estis omnem suppellectilem nostram?* What is our trespase, and what is the sinne that we haue committed in saying, and hearing the Masse, that ye are so wroth, and fume so much against vs?

Gen. 31.  
Expos  
tulation  
vvith  
the perse-  
cutions  
of the  
Masse.

*Ye haue searched al stufte*, as Iacob said to Laban, ye haue examined our doctrine, and what haue ye founde? Ye haue examined vs, ye haue deprived vs, ye haue condemned vs, some to prisons, some to certaine places, ye haue debarred vs of libertie to see our deare frendes, to enioye our swete Countrie, ye haue taken

from



## THE PREFACE TO

from vs great summes of money, ye haue thirsted our bloude; ye haue oftentimes called for the Princes sword to be drawen against vs, ye haue gotten the cause of the losse of many of our liues. This and much more, haue ye done touching our parte.

But as touching Gods parte, what iniurie, what dishonour, what pillages, what robberies, what Sacrileges, what spoiles, what prophane and Turkish saggages of Churches, what contempte, what despite, what villanies, ye and your brethren, haue done in sundry places of Christendome, what needeth it any man to speake, the secretes of hartes do speake, the sighing of Gods people speaketh, the Earth, the Heauen, God him selfe by his brute and dumme Creatures speaketh. But what auaileth it to make complaint vnto them, that be not onely farre from al grieve of their euil doing, and from remorse of conscience, but also reioyse, and glorie in malice?

**N**OW therefore to returne to thee good Reader, that thou maist the better vnderstand our proceedings, when at the first I tooke in hand to answer M. Iewels Chalége, and to iustifie the Articles, that rashly, and wickedly he had denied: amnog other things, I brought some of that I haue here said, and what elles then to me seemed good, for proufe of the Sacrifice of the Masse, which in his. vii. Article he denieth. Therto, as to the rest of my Answer, he hath made his Replie. In which Replie he hath said, what he was hable to say, in disproufe of that singular Sacrifice. But how insufficient his disproufe is, and of how litle substance al is that he hath brought, how



how little he amendeth his common woont of falsifying his testimonies, what other false partes he playeth, and what grosse errours he is fallen into: thou shalt perceiue, if thou vouchesafe to read this Reioindre.

Whereas against this Sacrifice, by many men many wordes haue ben said, many villanies haue ben wrought, many blasphemous bookes haue ben written (as is before mēcioned) according to the sprite, that Satan the enemy of the Sacrifice hath enspired into their wretched breastes: Out of al M. Iewel, like a Spyder, hath suckte the most venemous iouice, and in his Replie hath vttered it, as it were spitting forth his poison: Which Replie; as perhaps it poisoneth the lighter sorte, who haue delite to feede thereon: so to the wise, and those that be steadfast in the Catholique Faith, al the stuffe of his great booke appeareth, as it were but Cobwebbes. For in dede as with Cobwebbes nothing is holden, but light mores, and weake flees: euen so of a light witte, and feeble Faith he sheweth him selfe to be, whom that Replie catcheth, and holdeth.

He hath not one Auncient Doctour for him, nor one Councel, General, or Prouincial, olde, or newe, nor one Example of the Primitiue Church, nor one sentence of the holy Scriptures. Nor one I say for him, that is to wit, whereof any cleare conclusion may be gathered against the Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe. These doo I the rather make accompte of, because by his owne appointement, they be good waies and meanes, whereby to trie pointes of Faith in Controuersie.

Now if M. Iewel haue nothing out of al these for  
I ij a cleare

## THE PREFACE TO

a cleare disproue of this Sacrifice, after he hath vewed  
al the bookes that by these newe Maisters haue bene  
written in defence of his side, after that he hath fur-  
nished him selfe with al that euer Luther, Bucer, Zuin-  
glius, Oecolampadius, Caluine, Beza, and the vpholders  
of their sectes could deuise against it, after that he hath  
cōferred with his fellow Ministers and Superintēdentes,  
who most readily ioine their forces together against the  
Sacrifice, yea after that he hath learned the Argumentes  
of Satan him selfe the first Founder of this new Gospel,  
wherewith he impugned the blessed Masse disputing  
with Luther, as he witnesseth of him selfe, if I say after  
al this, he be hable to bring nothing, whereby this Sacri-  
fice to any learned man may seeme clearely disproo-  
ued: hereof thou maist soone conceiue good Reader,  
how assured and certaine the doctrine of the Catholike  
Churche is, that teacheth the Body and Bloud of Christ  
to be offered vp vnto God vnder the formes of breade  
and wine by Priestes, and the same to be the Sacrifice  
propre to the new Testament, and how litle there is to  
be said against it.

Bicause in this treatise I do mainteine my Answer,  
and disproue what M. Iewel hath replied against it,  
that the whole processe may seeme the plainer, and  
for that oftentimes I am driuen by him falsly reporting  
my woordes, to referre the Reader to that I said be-  
fore: I haue thought it necessary to set forth my An-  
swere, with His Replie, and my Reioindre together,  
the order of his Diuisions truly kepte. Wherefore  
when M. Iewel beareth thee in hande, that I speake ei-  
ther absurdly, or vnto truly, or that I make a sonde Ar-  
gument.

gument: it may please thee to returne backe vnto the  
 Answer, and vewing the place diligently, to consider,  
 whether thou finde, as he reporteth. If this be done,  
 I doubt not but the chiefe aduantage he seemeth to  
 take against me, shal in thy iudgement appeare to stand  
 altogether vpon manifest vntruthes.

Yea if thou wilt not be deceiued by M. Iewel, be-  
 leue not at the firste, what in prouise, or disprouise of  
 any thing, he reporteth, as out of others. Examine  
 the places from whence he bringeth his testimonies. be-  
 leue not his shewes, beleue thine owne eyes.

How M.  
 Iewels  
 vvritings  
 are to be  
 read.

Compare the authours texte, and his reportes to-  
 gether. And doubtlesse wheresoeuer he allegeth  
 ought that disagreeeth with the doctrine of the Ca-  
 tholique Church, thou maist be assured by diligent  
 searche to finde, that he hath corrupted and falsified  
 the Doctor, either by taking away, or by adding vnto,  
 by exchange of wordes, or by peruertering the order of  
 the sentence, by conceeling the Circumstance of the  
 place, or by applying it to a sense contrary to the wri-  
 ters meaning, briefly by one false meane or other, as  
 al merchantes of such false wares, lacke not craftes and  
 sleights to helpe their vtterance.

The  
 sleights  
 he  
 vseth in  
 vvriting  
 against  
 the Cas-  
 tholikes.

And as his sleights of corrupting the Doctours  
 be sundry and many, so be the meanes also many, and  
 of no lesse crafte, whiche he vseth in answering to  
 certaine their most plaine testimonies, with which of-  
 tentimes he is pressed. Some Doctours with him be  
 vtterly refused, some be of doubtful authoritie, some be  
 disliked for their age, some be auoided by a crafty vn-  
 derstanding, some that speake plainly, be tolde, they

The  
 sleights  
 he vseth  
 in an-  
 swering  
 to the  
 catho-  
 liques.

# THE PREFACE TO

speake violently. Whiche is a very poore shifte, and seemeth to haue least weight of Learning, or Reason.

When al other sleightes be spent, yet this serueth him for the last refuge. He draweth this mater of the Sacrifice, to Phrases of speache, Tropes, and Metaphores, and alleging some Tropical speache, that receiue a reasonable vnderstanding somewhat diuers from the literal sownde of the naked woordes, he requireth the place that maketh for the truth of the Sacrifice, to be in like sorte vnderstanded. This is a way whereby one may seme to say somewhat, when in deede he saith nothing. By suche meane the truthe in any controuersie is darkened, it is not discuffed, and in the iudgement of the vnlearned, confusion is wrought.

M. Iawels  
common  
Argu-  
mentes.

What shal I speake of the force of his Argumentes? Certainly they be suche, as very Boyes that learne their Sophistrie, may be a shamed to make. In manner he neuer maketh Argument against the Sacrifice, but wherein with one truth he excludeth an other truth, whiche kinde of reason, of al other is the most childish and fondest. As for example, Bicause the Fathers somerimes cal the Euchariste an Image, a Figure, a memorie, a sampler of the Sacrifice, that was made vpon the Crosse, thereof alwaies he concludeth, that it is not a true Sacrifice. As thoughe one might not by suche Logique conclude, that the Sacrifices of the olde Lawe were not truly, and properly Sacrifices, bicause they were al a Figure of that great Sacrifice, whiche Christe offered

fered when he died. Both Sacrifices are a signe of that one and the selfe same hoste, that of the Lawe, was a signe of the hoste to come, ours of that is paste. Yet either is a true Sacrifice.

Likewise of the affirmation of the Sacrifice of Praise, and Thankesgeuing, he induceth the denial of the true and real Sacrifice of Christes Body and Bloude in the Euchariste, as thoughe it were not bothe. But what neede I here Reader, to tel thee of M. Iewels manyfold shiftes and sleighes, sith I haue spoken thereof otherwheres, and other men haue detected them at large? And in deede what elles is contained in our bookes, but a discovering of his Le-gierdemaine? For how could the truthe haue bene set forth, excepte his lies had ben discried, and his falshooode confuted?

See the  
Preface  
before  
my first  
Reioing  
dre.

As for the Vntruthes, that be in his Replie to this parte of my Answer, I haue not curiously noted the number of them, for so much as that hath bene once doone by D. Sander, and me in parte, and by M. Stapleton more copiously. whereas the number of his Vntruthes founde in foure Articles onely of six and twenty, amount to a Thousand and odde, and the same are not yet discharged of M. Iewels parte: I intend not to bestow much time about such a lothsome worke. It is more meete for Pinners, Pointers, and Nailesellers, to spende their tyme about telling, and making such accompres.

And though I had liked to haue kepte tale of them, yet the Margent of my booke would not haue sufficed to containe them, the number is so great. Yet that



## THE PREFACE TO

that his lyes, falsifyinges, corruptions, and vntruthes, appeare to be of smal number, and that the shame, whiche would growe in respecte of the multitude, if al were seuerally tolde, be not to the hinderance of his estimation discoouered: I am content, his whole Replie touching this article, be taken (as it is in deede fewe things excepted, wherein gladly I agree with him) but for one Vntruth.

Touching this Reioindre, I haue here defended and confirmed my Answer to his 17. Article, whiche is of the Sacrifice, and al that he hath replied against it, I haue fully refelled. God geue thee iudgement good Reader, to discern truth from vntruth. If perhaps I shal seme in some places ouer obscure, and tedious, and not to haue framed my writing meete for al mennes capacities: thou maist thinke, that either learning failed, or that the mater would not suffer, verely good wil wanted not. To make harde things easy to be vnderstanded, and to geue light to things, that of them selfe be darke, and not to swarue from the exact rule of truth, it is a point of great witte and cunning: neither is it lightly perfourmed, but of suche as God hath endued with special giftes. And as excellencie of witte is required to vtter them plainely: so it behoueth the Readers senses be wel-exercised, to vnderstand them fully.

The doctrine of this Sacrifice in some parte is harde, and obscure, such, as commonly hath rather ben rightly beleeued, then by many clearly declared. The honour of holy Mysteries is better saued with reuerent silence, then with bolde opening. Experience teacheth  
into

into what danger of contempte they come, when they are openly reueled to populare vnderstanding.

Although bothe in the Scriptures, and in the Fathers, we haue most sufficient proues, and testimonies for the real presence, and for the real Sacrifice: yet they, that liued within the first six hundred yeres after Christe, wrote hereof more secretly, then of other pointes of our Religion. For reuerence of the Mysterie, they thought it more conuenient, to teache it by mowthe, and by tradition, then by euident, and open declaracion to commit muche to publique writing, least so to the Infidels, occasion should be ministred of despite and villanie. As for example, notwithstanding that religious warenesse, we read in S. Augustine, how the Painimes charged the Christians with the wourship of Ceres, and Bacchus their false Goddes, bicause of the bread and wine, they vsed in the celebration of their mysteries.

The cause  
why the  
olde Fa-  
thers spa-  
ke so se-  
cretly of  
these my-  
steries.

August. c.  
tra Faust.  
Manscha.  
lib. 20.  
cap. 13.

Thereof it is, that we finde in the auncient Fathers so often commendation of their silence. S. Chyistome saith in his Masse, *Conuiuij tui mystici hodie fili Dei communionem assumpsisti, non tamen hostibus tuis mysterium dixisti*. I haue receiued this day the Communion of thy mystical banquet & Sonne of God, and yet I haue not tolde the Mysterie vnto thine enemies.

Chrysost.  
in Liturg.

S. Ambrose maketh it a Treason, and betraying of the Mysteries, to shewe them vnto those that be not yet baptized. The like commendation of silence in this behalfe wee finde in Origen, and in S. Augustines workes not seldom: Aurelianus the Emperour, when he saw him selfe, and the Romaine Empire to be in great peril, for that the peo-

Ambro. li.  
De ijs qui  
initiantur  
myster. c. 1  
Orige. ho-  
mil. 9 in  
Leuit. c. 16

# THE PREFACE TO

ple named *Marcomanni* grewe strong ouer him by a great ouerthrowe they had geuen him in bataile, wrote to the Senate of Rome, that (whiche was woont to be done in publike distresse) the Sibylles bookes should be looked in. In his Epistle he hath these woordes. *Miror vos Patres sancti, tam diu de aperiendis Sibyllinis dubitasse libris, perinde quasi in Christianorum Ecclesia, non in Templo Deorum omnium tractaretis.* I marvel at you Reuerend Fathers, that ye haue ben afraid to open Sibylles bookes thus long, as though ye had to doo in the Church of Christians, and not in the Temple of al the Goddes.

By this it appeareth, what secretnesse and silence was vsed in the Primitiue Church touching these mysteries, and how feareful the holy Fathers were to say, write, or doo any thing, whereby the Mischeantes might come by knowledge of them. For which cause it is not to be marueled, if they spake not so plainly, and so euidently of euery point touching the Sacrifice, as the sawcinesse of heretikes requireth in these daies to be answered, and satisfied withal. Yet they may seme to haue spoken plainly ynough to right beleuers, and for the same we haue no smal number of good and cleare testimonies, as by this Reioindre it shal appeare to them, that be not wilfully bent, either to shutte their eyes, bicause they would not see, or to wrangle contentiously, that they seme not to be ouercomme, or to denie stubbornly, what so euer disliketh their phansie, be it neuer so sufficiently proued.

But after that the Faith was once generally receiued of al where it was preached and professed, and no Infidels

*Elauius  
Vopiscus  
in Diuo  
Aureliano*

*When  
began the  
Fathers  
to speake  
more plain-  
ly of our  
mysteries*

Infidels remained among the Christians, that durst openly to worke despite against the holy Mysteries, whiche in sundry Prouinces came to passe before the first six hundredth yere was determined, and thenceforth: the learned Fathers that in those times wrote, as occasiō was geuē, spake of the real Presence of the body an bloud of Christe in the blessed Sacramēt, and of the oblatiō of the same, no lesse plainly, and clearely, then the Church now teacheth. Whiche thing they finde to be true, that be conuerfant in the workes of Cassiodorus, S. Gregorie the Romaine, Isidorus, Gregorius Turonensis, Beda, Haimo, Rabanus, and other about that age.

If then for this Sacrifice we haue (as in this Reioindre thou shalt finde) the Scriptures, the testimonies of the Fathers of the first six hundred yeres of sufficient clearnes, and the most manifest testimonies of the writers that immediatly folowed that age, besides the authoritie of Councils, that were within, and soone after that age, and so continually vntil the late Council of Trent: the fauourers of M. Iewels side may see, his Challenge fully answered, touching this Article. And therefore ought they to consider, how safe it is for them to contemne so great authoritie, and to be perswaded with suche slender Argumentes against the blessed Sacrifice of the Masse, as M. Iewel setteth forth in his Replie, whiche he hath borrowed of the Caluinistes; they receiued of Luther, and Luther learned of Satan, when on a night he disputed with him against the Sacrifice of the Masse, as he lay waking in his bed, as by his owne confession in his booke *De Missa priuata*, he hath witnessed vnto the worlde.

So then if



## THE PREFACE TO

with Luther, Caluine, and M. Iewel they professe hatred against the Masse, and denie the real Sacrifice of the Church: they shewe whose scholars they be, and by whose sprite they are leade.

whether  
the Masse  
be to be  
taken for  
an euil  
thing, se-  
ing Satan  
disputeth  
with  
Luther  
against it.

But perhappes some here wil say, what is that this Reioinderer telleth vs of Satan? Did Satan euer dispute with Luter against the Masse? Is this credible? If it be so, then may I soone beleue, that the Masse is a godly thing, and that it procedeth from the holy Ghoste. For if it were an euil thing, as by our Preachers we are borne in hande it is: we may be sure, the Deuil would not moue Luther to leaue it. For so he should worke the destruction of his owne kingdom: whiche to doo is the office of Christe, and most contrary to the malice of Satans condiciō. This Reioinderer should do wel here to cleare him selfe of the vehement suspiciō of an vntruth. And in deede shame it were to belye the Deuil, as they say.

*The disputation of Satan the Deuil with Luther against  
the Masse, truly reported out of Luthers  
owne Workes.*

In the  
Replie.  
Disputatiō.  
Pag. 2.

**F**OR asmuch then, as I vnderstand, many doubt here of, and M. Iewel calleth it a scorneful, and slaundersous tale, blased abroad by Pighius, Hosius and Statphylus, of malice, and hatred of the truth: to thintent the truth be knowen, and that it be considered what Captaine they folowe, who make warre against the Sacrifice of the Masse, and that the memorie of this thing remaine to our posteritie: I wil here truly and faithfully set forth the disputation, that was betwixt Frier Luther the first author and founder of the Protestantes Religion.



gion, and Satan the Deuil, as Luther him selfe reporteth it in the seuēth Tome of his workes, in a booke intituled *De Missa priuata, & Vnctione Sacerdotum*. Who soeuer is desirous to see the place, it is to be founde in the seuēth Tome printed at Wittēberg by one Thomas Klug, in the yere of our Lorde. 1557. Folio. 228. There thus writeth Luther.

Luthers report of his Confes-  
rence vvith the Deuil.

*Contigit me semel, &c.* It  
befel me on a time, that  
after midnight suddainly I  
awooke. Then Satan began  
disputation with me after  
this manner. *Audi, inquit,*  
*Luthere Doctor perdocte.*

Listen, q he, 1 right lear-  
ned M. Doctor Luther.

2. Thou knowest thou hast  
celebrated priuate Masses  
these fiftē yeres almost e-  
uery day.

3. What if suche priuate  
Masses were horrible Ido-  
latrie?

4. What

A brieft Reprouse of these  
Diuelish Blatphemies.

1. In this insinuation the De-  
uill claweth the vaine glorious  
Frier by the backe as it were,  
where he knew him to itche,  
*Right learned M. Doctor Luther,*  
q he.

2. Thou liest Satan, as thy  
woont is. Luther knew not,  
ne could not know that which  
is false. For in that which is  
chiefly to be accompted of, the  
Masse is publlque and cōmon.  
Out of thy scoole the name of  
Priuate Masse in the sense that  
Luther conceiueth, first pro-  
ceeded.

*Priuat  
Masse the  
Deuils  
terme.*

3. VVhat if they were not?  
as this Sacrifice is the highest  
honour that can be done vnto  
God, being done, as it ought  
to be.

m iij

4. VVhat

# THE PREFACE TO

Denial of  
Adoratiō  
of Christs  
body, the  
Deuils  
Doctrinē.

4 What if it were so, that the body and bloud of Christe were not present, but that thou didst adoure bread and wine onely, and shewedst the same to be adoured of others?

To whom I answered. I am an annointed Priest, I haue receined vnction and consecration of a Bishop, and al these thinges haue I done 5 by cōmaundement of my Superiours. Why should I not haue cōsecrated, sith that I pronounced the wordes of Christe seriously, and celebrated Masses in great earnest? This muche thou knowest.

The De.  
uill cōfesseth out  
vvard  
Priesthod  
M. leuvel  
beneeth.

6 Al this ( q Satan ) is true.

7 But the Turkes and the Gentiles also doo al thinges in their temples vpon obediēce, and make their sacrifices in earnest. The Priestes of Ieroboā also did al thinges with a certaine zeale, and desire contrary to the true Priestes that were in Ierusalem.

8 And

4 VVhar if it were present? as it is present consecration duly made. And so Luther him selfe teacheth against the Sacramentaries, as it is knowen. Marcke Reader, from whose schoole the doctrine cometh, that teacheth, the body and bloud not to be adoured in the blessed Sacrament.

5 Not only of them, but rather by cōmaundement of Christe, whosaid, *do this in my remembrance.*

6 Ergo, Luther was a Priest, specially, and properly, not as euery faithfull is. Then had he auctoritie and povver to offer the Sacrifice. This muche thou cōfessest vnrwares, as it semeth. M. leu. denieth. VVhat is he worse then thee selfe?

7 Such obedience of Turkes, and Gentiles, is not for Gods sake. And therefore it is not obedience, as it is a vertue, and a seruice of God. It is the seruitude of thee, Satan. VVherefore therein the more earnest, the more sinneful. The Zeale likewise thou speakest of vvas vicked, therefore the case is not like, ad so thy reason is naught.

8 And what if thy taking of Orders, and consecration were also false, as the Turkes, and Samaritanes Priestes, are false Priestes, and their worship is false and wicked worship?

First thou knowest, q he, 9 At that time thou hadst no knowledge of Christe, nor true faith, and as touching faith, thou wast no better then any Turke. For the Turke, yea al the Devils also doo beleue the storie of Christe, that he was borne, that he was crucified, that he died &c. But the Turke and we reiect sprites doo not truste in his mercie, neither haue we him for a mediator and Sauour, but feare him as a cruel Iudge.

This manner of faith, and none other thou hadst, when thou tokest vntio of a Bishop, and 10 al others, bothe the annointers, and the anointed, so thought of Christ, and none otherwise.

8 But vvhath if it vvere true? as it vvas true.

9 Here thou lyest Satan doune right.

10 Anaunt Satan, thou beliest Gods seruantes.

For wof

11 It is

## THE PREFACE TO

For that cause ye fled  
from Christ, as from a cruel  
Iudge, to S. Marie, and the  
Saintes.

They were your medi-  
atours, betwene you and  
Christe: so the glorie  
was taken from Christe.

The De-  
uil calleth  
vs Papis-  
tes.

13 This neither thou, nor  
any other Papist can denie.  
Therefore ye are annoin-  
ted, consecrated and sha-  
uen, and haue sacrificed in  
the Masse, as Gentiles, and  
Heathens, and not as Chri-  
stians.

11 It is not so thou enemye.  
When we beseeche S. Marie,  
and the other Saintes to pray  
for vs, we flee not fro Christe,  
no more then S. Paule did, whe  
he desired the Romans, the  
Ephesiāns, and the Theſſaloniāns  
to pray for him: Rom. 15. Ephes.  
6. 2. 1 theſſ 3. but vve go to Christ  
with other helpers, and futers,  
as if hauing a Iute to an earthly  
Prince, I make his mother, and  
his dearest frendes to go ynto  
him with me, ad speake for me.

12 By making the Saintes in-  
tercessours for vs to Christe, no  
part of his glorie is taken from  
him. Marke Reader, who it is  
that teacheth thee, not to cal to  
the Saintes for their aides, and  
prayers.

13 This we al doo denie, and  
know it to be false. It pleaseth  
vs to be called Papistes of thee  
Satan. Auaunt blasphemous  
Sprite. In the blessed Masse,  
wee present, and offer to God  
that body, that suffered vpon  
the Crosse, and that bloude that  
was shed for vs, whereby we  
are redeemed from thee, and fro  
thy most guilty miserie. By this  
tale we are taught to esteeme  
amounting, consecration, and  
shauing better, because the De-  
uil liketh it not.

How

14 How then could ye consecrate in the Masse, and celebrate a true Masse, sith that (which thing after your owne doctrine marreth altogether) there wanteth a person hauing power to consecrate? &c.

And there afterward *Folio. 229. b.* it foloweth.

*In his angustys & c.* Being in these 15 straightes, and in this conflict against the Deuil, my wil was to knocke him againe, with the weapons that I was accustomed vnto lyuing in Papistrie, and I laid for me the Intention, and 16 faith of the Church, to wit, that I had celebrated priuat Masses in the faith, and intention of the Church.

Albeit (q I) 17 that I haue not beleued or thought rightly, yet in this point the Church beleueth, and thinketh rightly.

But then Saran laying at me more mightily, and more vehemently, Go too, q, he, bring me forth,

18 where

14 The Deuil procedeth to his Conclusion, as though his premisses vvere true. VVherein M. Ievv. folovveth him, as the scholer the Maister, and so doo al other the Sacramentaries, and Protestantes.

15 VVhy didst thou not blesse thee, and arme thy selfe vvith the signe of the Crosse? VVhy didst thou not cal vpon the name of Iesus? Thoughtest thou thy selfe hable to matche the Deuil vvith vvordes?

16 If thou hadst the Faith of the Church, vvhy vvventst thou from it? And if thou hadst this Faith, then hovv beleuest thou not Christe, saying, *Do as this in my remembrance?*

17 By this thou impliest, that the rest of the Church, before thou brochedst thy fifth Gospel, beleued not Rightly, wherein thou folowest Satan, and beliest thy selfe, and the Church. For the common profession of the Faith, was then right and sounde.

n 18 To



## THE PREFACE TO

18 where it is written, that a man, which is wicked and vnbeleeuing, may stande at the Aulter of Christe, and consecrate in the faith of the Church? Where hath God bid or commaunded this thing? How wilt thou prooue, that the Church doth impart vnto thee, Intention to this thy priuate Masse?

If now thou haue not  
19 the worde of God for thee, but if men haue taught thee this thinge without the worde, then all this Doctrin is a lye. Beholde your boldnes. &c.

And after this in the ende of the Disputation (for it were to long to recite al) thus it foloweth. *Fol. 230.*

*Confessus quidē sum, lege  
Dei cōuictus coram Diabolo,  
me peccasse, me damnatum  
esse vt Iudam: sed verso me  
ad Christum cum Petro, &c.*

Being

18 To confounde this Frier, the Deuil ioyneeth a vicked man, and an vnbeleeuier together in the case of Consecratio, and requireth Scripture of him for that, which neither was, ne neuer shalbe done. An euil Priest, notwithstanding his wickednes of life, may consecrate, though to his damnation, as he may baptise, and absolue: but an vnbeleuing man, that is to say, an Infidel, can not consecrate. And what absurditie is it to say, an vnbeleeuing mā to consecrate in the Faith of the Church? If in the Faith of the Church, how is he vnbeleeuing? If vnbeleeuing, how in the Faith of the Church?  
19 For this Oblation, and Sacrifice, we haue the worde of Christe, *Do yethis in my remembrance.*

20 Being caste by the law of God, I was faine to confesse before the Deuil, that I had sinned, and that I was damned like Iudas.

21 But I turne my self vnto Christe with Peter. &c.

20 Say not foolish Fryer, thou were caste by the law of God, but by the Deuil for desert of thine ovvne iniquitie. Thou makest Satan thy Ghostly Father, vvho aftervvard taughtst, that confession ought not to be made to a Priest for benefite of absolution.

21 No, no, thou turnedst thy self from Christ vnto the Deuil vvith Iudas, vvith Simō Mag<sup>o</sup>, and vvith other Heretiques. And so do al, that solovv thee, and thy doctrine.

This is the Summe of the conference and disputation that Satan had with Frier Luther against the Sacrifice of the Masse, by which Luther was perswaded, not only to say Masse no more, but also to write, preach, and worke against it in suche wise, as became Satans scholer.

And thus thou seest Reader, that this is not a tale maliciously, and sclaunderously blased abroad by Pighius, Hosius, and Staphylus, as M. Iewel saith: but that it is in great sooth reported, and in printed bookes published to the worlde, by Luther him selfe. Though M. Iewel be ashamed to heare of it, yet he alloweth Satans Conclusion against the Masse. The person of such a Schoole-master he commendeth not, but the Scholer he praiseth, calling him, *that godly man Doctor Luther*, and the doctrine he imbraceth.

By this we may conceiue, what resistance the professors of this new Gospel wil make against Antichrist,

n ij when

In M.  
levvells  
Replie.  
pag. 2.

## THE PREFACE TO

when he shal come, among who the doctrine of the Deu-  
il him selfe is so soone receiued, so wel liked, so boldly  
defended. But o foolish Frier, whose vnstedfast harre  
was so soone ouerthrowen by Satans wicked sugge-  
stions, false lyes, and vaine reasons. And o light,  
and miserable soules, that sithens with the winde of  
that lewd Friers doctrine haue ben carried away. For  
what is there in al Satans tale, in Luthers bookes, in the  
treatises of al his Scholers of Germanie, of Cranmare,  
Peter Martyr, Zuinglius, Oecolampadius, Caluine, Be-  
za, of al the other Sacramentaries, briefly in the whole  
Replie of M. Iewel, whose Puddel is filled with their  
Sinckes: that ought to withdraw any learned, wise, or  
godly man, from that beleefe touching the Sacrifice of  
the body and Bloude of Christe, whiche the Catholique  
Churche hath alwayes taught from the beginning?

• What so euer they haue said, and what so euer they  
can say against this blessed Sacrifice, assure thy selfe  
Christian Reader, the effecte of al here shalt thou finde,  
laid together in M. Iewels Replie. Al whiche, of how  
litle force it is, consideratly perusing, and weghing this  
Reioindre, thou shalt perceiue. Although the autho-  
ritie of the Churche be ynough to stay thee, yet if thou  
desire to see the Aduersarie encountred, and his Ob-  
iections answered: reade what I haue here written,  
and iudge, not forgetting to cal to God forthe assistance  
of his holy Spirite, to illuminate thy vnderstanding, and  
to purge thy affection: that thou maist see, what is true,  
obserue the same, and haue a ful wil to perforce what  
is good, and acceptable before God.

The

*The chiefe, and most common Argument, that the  
Protestantes make against the Sacrifice  
of the Masse.*

S. Paule declareth in the Epistle to the Hebrewes, that Christ Heb. 9.  
was but once onely offered, and that he offereth not him selfe  
oftentimes. By his owne bloude (saith the Apostle) he entred in once Cap. 9.  
into the holy place, and founde eternal redemption. Againe, He was but  
once offered to take away the sinnes of many. And in an other place,  
VVith one oblation he hath made perfite them that are sanctified for euer. Heb. 10.  
Ergo, to what purpose is it, that Christe is thus daily offered vp  
vnto God in the Masse?

*Solution:*

This Argument is soone solued, if a man consider  
the scope, marke, and purpose, wherevnto S. Paule di-  
recteth him selfe in that Epistle. This muche therefore is  
to be weighed. There were many of the Hebrewes, that  
although through the preaching, and miracles of the  
Apostles, were perswaded to beleue in Christe, yet re-  
mained in great estimation, and zeale of the Law, stickte  
vnto their olde customes, and ordinances of Moyse,  
and specially vnto their Sacrifices, whiche they were  
desirous to retaine for their sinnes. And therefore they  
founde them selues agreeued with the Apostle, for that,  
whereas he tooke away their olde Sacrifices, they  
thought them selues to be destitute of the benefites of  
the Lawe, and remedies for sinne.

Herevnto the Apostle maketh answere, and in effect  
teacheth: That of such Sacrifices as the Lawe ordeined,  
now we haue no neede, for so much as the Priesthood of  
Christ, who hath once offered him selfe with sheadding of

his bloude vpon the Aulter of the Crosse hauing thereby fulfilled them, remaineth and continueth stil with vs, whiche is sufficient. *We haue* (saith he to them) *an Aulter, whereof it is not lawfull for them to eate, whiche doo*  
**Heb. 13.** *serue the Tabernacle.* And that ye see not hostes to be killed, and the bloude of Calues to be shed of vs, the cause is, for that the onely blouddy hoste of Christe hath sufficed, that now we haue neede of no other, but of that. That hoste is the founteine, and endlesse treasure, whiche containeth the sufficient price of our Redemption. onely it is neede, that wee be made partakers of it. Neither were those Sacrifices of Moysees lawe suche, that by vertue and power of them being but signes and figures of Christ, synnes were remitted in conscience: but by them synnes were brought to remembrance, and signification was geuen out, that there was neede of an other blouddy Sacrifice, by whose vertue men in conscience should be made persfite.

**Heb. 9.** And so the Apostle treateth of the thing it selfe, that was shadowed in al the Sacrifices of the Law, and is so acceptable vnto the Father, that by his owne propre vertue and merite it sanctifieth men, and remitteth sinnes, whereunto by the ordinance of Gods iustice the Bloude of the Sonne of God was Requifite. Suche is the Hoste or Sacrifice of the Crosse onely, by whose vertue and merite they be sanctified, whosoeuer from the beginning either by the Sacrifices of the former times, or by the daily Sacrifice of the Church, are sanctified. By whiche onely for this cause al be said to be sanctified, bicause who so euer be sanctified, be by that, and by the vertue of that, made cleane. In case the olde  
Sacrifi-



Sacrifices, or the Sacrifice of the Masse also were suche sufficient prices of our redēption, without doubte bothe those, and this, had long sithens ceased to be offered. For suche a Sacrifice, whiche by his owne proper merite geteth sufficient price for sinnes, ought to be great in deede (soothly by the Death of the Sonne of God) but one onely sufficeth. Wherefore of a blouddy Sa-  
Heb. 10.crifice there is no more neede, but of suche a one, as by which we may be made partakers of that great and most worthy Sacrifice. Of whiche sorte the Sacrifice of the Masse is, where, in the person of Christe, that Death is presented for vs vnto the Father.

And what Hoste, or thing mystically offered, could either better set Christes Death before his Fathers sight, or more effectually deriue the merites of his Death vnto vs, then that very body, wherein he suffered? For which cause, when he deliuered the Sacrament of his Porsion vnto vs, he said, *Doo ye this in remembrance of*  
Luce 22.*me*. So that this Sacrifice of the Masse, although it be in his kinde a true Sacrifice, as it shalbe proued here after in this Reioindre: yet it taketh his whole vertue, and power, of the Sacrifice of the Crosse, which is of it selfe the whole price of our Redemption. Now S. Paul disputeth with the Hebrewes of that whiche with bloudshed redemed vs, and not of that whiche without bloudshed applieth the Redemption vnto vs. That was but once offered, this is, and must be ofte repeated.

*Faultes escaped in printing.*

Faulte	leafe	line	Correction
<i>Accidententes</i>	31.b.	24.	<i>Accidentes</i>
<i>Singular</i>	47.a	11.	<i>Singular</i>
<i>and</i>	56.b.	20.	<i>and</i>
<i>in here</i>	75.a.	4.	<i>is here</i>
<i>the termeth</i>	94.a.	21.	<i>be termeth</i>
<i>and</i>	108.b.	5.	<i>and</i>
<i>sacrificed</i>	111.a.	3.	<i>sacrificed</i>
<i>Exiam num</i>	117.b.	25.	<i>Exiam nume</i>
<i>the vnbloudy</i>	119.b.	33.	<i>the bloudy</i>
<i>taught them the new test.</i>	131.b.	26.	<i>taught them the newe Obla- tion of the newe Testament</i>
<i>argume</i>	136.b.	30.	<i>argument</i>
<i>neither be they</i>	140.b.	13.	<i>neither be they</i>
<i>and circumstance</i>	149.b.	23.	<i>any circumstance</i>
<i>is the Masse, in one</i>	195.b.	10.	<i>in the Masse, is one</i>
<i>and maketh haste</i>	208.a.	10.	<i>and make hast</i>
<i>be briefly examined</i>	215.b.	15.	<i>be briefly examined</i>

*In the Epistle to M. Iew.*

*Page. 1. In the margent read, Math. 5.*  
*Item there pag. 11. Lin. 2. for new broched, read, new broched.*  
*Item there pag. 13. Lin. 11. for hen read, ben.*  
*Item there Pag. 15. Lin. 14. for him, reade, him.*



*A REIOINDRE TO M.  
JEWELS REPLIE AGAINST  
THE SACRIFICE OF THE  
MASSE.*

*The wordes of M. Jewels  
Challenge.*

**I**F any learned man of our Aduersaries, or if al the learned men that be alyue, be hable to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any olde Catholike Doctour or Father, or out of any olde general Coūcel, or out of the holy Scriptures of God, or any one example of the Primitiue Church, wherby it may clearly and plainly be proued, that for the space of sixe hundred yeres after Christe, the Priest had authoritie to offer vp Christe vnto his Father, I am content to yeelde and to subscribe.

*The wordes of the Answer first made  
to this Challenge.*

Of the Priestes auctoritie to offer vp  
Christe to his Father.

**C**Hrist is offered vp to his Father after three man-  
ners. Figuratiuely, Truely with Bloudshedding,  
and Sacramentally, or Mystically. In Figure or Signi-  
fication he was offered in the Sacrifice made to GOD,  
A bothe

Agnus oc-  
cisus est ab  
origine  
mundi.  
Apoc. 13.  
Heb. 10.  
Lib. 6. c. 5

bothe in the time of the Lawe of Nature, and also in the time of the lawe written. And therefore S. Iohn calleth Christe the Lambe, which was killed from the beginning of the world, meaning in figure. The Sacrifices of Abel, Noe, and Abraham, and al those of the people of Israel commaunded by the Lawe of Moses, figured and signified Christe. For whiche respecte chiefly, the lawe is reported of S. Paule, to haue the shadowe of the good thinges to come. S. Augustine writing against Faustus the Heretike, saith: Testamenti Veteris Sacrificia omnia, multis & varijs modis vnum Sacrificium, cuius nunc memoriã celebramus, significauerunt: All the Sacrifices of the olde Testament signified by manie, and sundrie waies this one Sacrifice, whose memorie we doo nowe celebrate. And in an other place he saith, That in those Fleashly Sacrifices, there was a Significatiõ of Christes Fleash, which he shoulde offer for sinnes, and of his Bloud, which he should sheadde for the remission of our sinnes.

De fide ad  
Petru Dia  
conu. c. 19.

Tit. 2.  
Ephes. 5.

Truely, and with Bloudsheadding, Christ is offered on the Crosse in his owne person, wherof S. Paule saith: Christ gaue hī self for vs, that he might redeme vs frō al iniquitie. And againe, Christ hath loued vs, and hath deliuered him selfe for vs an Oblation, and Sacrifice to God into a svete sauour. Sacramentally, or in Mysterie, Christ is offered vp to his



his Father in the daily Sacrifice of the Church vnder the Forme of Bread, and Wine, truely and in deede, not in respect of the manner of offering, but in respect of his very Bodie, and Bloude, really (that is in deede) present, as it hath ben sufficiently proued here before.

M. Jewels Replie.

The greater, and vvorther the vwork is, that our Adversaries haue imagined, that is, for a Mortal, and a Miserable man to offer up the Immortal Sonne of God vnto his Father, and that Really, and in deede, the more ought the same, either by manifest vwoordes, or by necessarie collection expressly, and plainly to be proued. For noman taketh honour, and office vnto him self, but he that is called, and appointed thereto by God. But for ought that may appeare by anie clause or sentence, either of the newe Testament or of the olde, God neuer appointed anie such Sacrifice to be made by anie Mortal Creature. And Theophylacte saith, Iesus efficiendo boues & columbas, pręsignauit non vltra opus esse animalium Sacrificio, sed Oratione: Iesus throvving the Oxen ad Dooues out of the Temple, signified, that they should no longer haue nede of the Sacrifice of beastes, but of prayer.

Hebr. 5.

Theophyl.  
in Matt.  
cap. 21.

Harding.



WVLD God M. Jewel, that either your modestie were more, or that you had the grace to see, howe euil your fauinness becommeth you. As at the first by open Challenge you prouoked all the learned men that be alyue, as it were to trye maisterie with you: so in the entrie of your Replie against my Answer to your seuētiēth Article, you beare

A ij al men



al men in hand, that vntil you came frō the schole of Rhetorike to teach the world this new Gospel, no priest euer considered, how great and worthy a worke it is, to offer vp Christe vnto his Father, which apperteineth to Priestly office. Wherein you charge the blessed Apostles, their successours, al the holy Fathers of the Church so many as were Priestes, al that haue ben to your time, briefly the whole Church it self, with the crime of wicked presumption, for making this sacrifice. How cā you seme otherwise to doo? For whereas you say, *it may not appeare by any Clause, or sentēce of the olde, or new Testament, that God euer appointed any such Sacrifice to be made by any Mortal mā,* and most certaine it is, that by the Apostles, and the holy Fathers of the Church, and by the priestes of God in euery age, it hath ben made: what cōclude you hereof, but that they haue trāsgressed the Scripture, and presumptuously takē honour and office vnto them selues, not being called, nor appointed thereto by God? And so what may Christ be thought to haue meant in suffering such a heinous errour so long to continue in his Church, which he loueth so derely, to which he promised the assistance of the holy Ghoste the spirite of truth for euer?

Hebr. 5.

Esa. 59.

Iohan. 14.

Mat. 28.

Gen. 16.

Cant. 6.

But consider M. Iewel against whom, and how many, you strine. Will it do your hart good to heare that spoken of Iewel which by the Angel of God was spokē of Ismael. *Manus eius cōtra oēs, et manus oīm contra eū?* The hand of him against al, and the hand of al against him? Stande you so farre in your owne conceite, as to thinke, you shal be able to stand against al? Remēber you not, what is said of the Church, that it is, *terribilis, ut castrorū acies ordinata,* terrible, like the foreward of an Armie set in battaile raie?

But

But leauing to put you in minde of that, which might withdraw you frō your wicked doctrine, either for feare of God, or for shame of mē, hauing litle hope by wordes to do good with you, to th'intent the weakenes of your part laid forth to be cōsidered, the vnlearned Reader, that perhaps is seduced by you, may be admonished to beware of you, and to geue no more credite vnto you, then a professed enemie of the Church, and a teacher of falshod deserueth: I wil come to the examinatio of your Replie.

You seme to deduce an argumēt against this Sacrifice made by a priest, of the basenes and vilenesse of humaine cōdition, as though mā, *who in dede is mortal ad miserable, ad a mortal creature*, as you terme him, were not worthy, ne could not be made worthy, to offer vp the Immortal Sōne of God vnto his Father. True it is, Man of him self, is very vnworthy of that high office: neither cā he by any his owne power or vertue, reache vnto the worthines of that soueraine honour. But if it please God of his great loue towards his owne dere creature, to admit mā to that dignitie, notwithstanding he be neuer so vnworthy of him self: so he is made worthy. Neither Anna, nor Elizabeth, nor blessed Marie her selfe, nor any other woman was euer worthy of her self to cōceiue, and bring forth th'Immortal Sōne of God: yet the virgin Marie through grace of him whom she bare, was made worthy to beare him. *ad therfor she said, fecit mihi magna q potēs est*, he hath done me great thinges, that is mighty. Els if cōsideration of the mortal and miserable cōditio of man, might be brought in argumēt for the cōtrary, what a wide dore were opened vnto the scholers of *Marciō, Manichaeus, Apollinaris*, and to other Heretikes, to rush in, and to thrust in againe their

Luc. 1.

old heresies against the truth of the Flesh assumed, and the Incarnation of Christe?

Gene. 18.

To how  
great di-  
gnity a  
man mor-  
tal and  
misera-  
ble, hath  
ben ad-  
mitted  
by God.

Num. 12.

Exod. 33.

Exodi. 3.

Exod. 19.

Abraham was a man, mortal and miserable as we are, *dust and ashes*, as he said himselfe: yet was he made worthy to haue talke with God, and to vnderstand his purpose touching the destruction of Sodoma. Moyse likewise, though he were but a mortal and miserable man, was accepted worthy, with whom God spake *mouth to mouth*, and as the Scripture saith, *face to face, as a man is wont to speake vnto his friend*, to see our Lorde openly without obscure signes and figures, to be Gods Ambassadour vnto Pharaon, and the people of Israel, to enter into the Cloude vpon the hill where God was, and there to receiue the Lawe written with Gods owne finger.

Mat. 3.

Mat. 28.

Ioan. 20.

And to come againe vnto the newe Testament, what a dignitie is it for Iohn the Baptiste to baptise Christe, for the Apostles and their successours to carrie his name, and his worde through out the whole worlde, to remit, and retaine sinnes? Shal we denye, or so much as cal in question these great things, because they be mortal and miserable men, to whom they are committed? Notwithstanding the mortalitie and miserie of mankinde, yet beholde what a high dignitie men are called vnto by testimony of S. Iohn: *Dedit eis potestatem filios Dei fieri*: He hath geuen them power to be made the sonnes of God. Vnto which dignitie S. Paul addeth a farther degree, saying: *Si autem filij, & heredes: heredes quidem Dei, coheredes autem Christi*. If we be the sonnes of God then we be also the heires: the heires of God, and fellow heires with Christe. That high degree of honour which S. Peter speaketh of, surmounteth al other, neither can any other vnto

Ioan. 1.

Rom. 8.

against the Sacrifice of the Masse.

4

vnto it be cōparable. Which is, that God through Christe hath bestowed vpon vs so great giftes, *ut efficiamur Diuina consortes natura*, that we be made partakers of the Diuine nature. 2. Pet. 1.

Verily of the high dignitie that it hath pleased God to admitte man vnto, in these and other the like cases, that may wel be said against M. Iewel, and all other the enemies of this Sacrifice, which King Assuerus commaunded openly to be proclaimed of good *Mardocheus* against wicked Aman, *Hoc honore dignus est, quemcunque rex voluerit honorare*. Of this honour is he worthy, whō so euer the King (of al Kings) wil haue honoured. And this is a sufficient answere to M. Iewels secrete obiection against the Sacrifice, taken of the basenesse and miserie of humane condition. Ester. 6.

He wil saye perhaps, these examples and Scriptures prooue in dede, that God hath aduanced man vnto high honour, but not that he may offer vp Christ vnto his Father: For (saith he) *for ought that may appeare by any clause or sentence of the newe Testament, or of the olde, God neuer appointed any such Sacrifice to be made*. Such stoute asseuerations make but weake proufes. Here might be alleged for the Sacrifice, first, out of the olde Lawe the Figures foresignifying, and the Prophecies foretelling, that suche Sacrifice was to be instituted. Secondly, out of the newe Testament, Christes owne facte offering this Sacrifice, and his plaine precepte, commaunding his Apostles, and their successours in the office of Priesthood, to continue the same vntil his comming. Thirdly, the interpretation of the Fathers expounding in that sense, both those figures and Prophecies of the olde Testament, and likewise Christes

M. Iewel  
denieth  
the Sacrifice  
of the  
Aulter  
stoutely.

1.

2.

3.



4.

Christes facte, and precepte in the newe Testament. Last of al, the continual practife of the vniuersal Church, both Greke and Latine, wherein the Priestres in al ages since Christes death, haue made to God, a Sacrifice of our Lordes body and bloude. But because this is done already in the discourse of my Answer to this 17. Article of M. Iewels Challenge, leauing to repeate the same here againe, when orderly proceeding I shal come vnto the places by M. Iewels Replie impugned: there (I truste) I shal by disclosing the Repliers false sleighes, and by bewraying the weakenesse of his Replie, to the indifferent and vnaffectionate Reader euidently shewe, how strong and sound the Catholike doctrine of the Church is in this behalfe, and how inuincibly the testimonies of the Scriptures and Fathers which in my Answer I alleged, proue and establish the same.

VWhat  
may for  
lovv, if al  
be takē as  
vway, that  
hath not  
prouse of  
Scripture.  
Anabaptis-  
tes.  
Arians.

Iouiniani-  
stes.  
Heluidiās.

Sabbata-  
ries.

But touching such kinde of assertions, as this is of M. Iewels, if they may take place, and if it shal be ynough to say, *for ought that may appeare*: shal it not seme laful to the Anabaptistes to say, away with the baptizing of infantes, For, for ought that may appeare, the Scriptures geue vs no warrāt so to do? Wil not the blasphemous Ariās say, away with Cōsubstātiālitie, and equalitie of Christ with his Father? For, for ought that may appeare, it can not be auouched by any Clause, or sentēce, either of the new Testamēt, or of the olde. Wil not the folowers of Iouinian and Heluidius say, away with the perpetual Virginitie of our blessed Lady Christes Mother? For, for ought that may appeare, the Scriptures be plaine against it, rather then with it. The Sabbataries, wil not they cry out agāist keping holly and solēne the Sōday? For, for ought that may appeare (say



*against the Sacrifice of the Masse.*

3

(say they) the cōmaudemēt to hallow the Saturday, stā-  
deth stil in force, neither is there any clause, or sentēce in  
the olde, or new Testament, bidding vs to chaunge it into  
the Sondag. To be shorr, what Heretike euer was there  
in olde time, or is at this day, whose turne this kind of as-  
sertion (*for ought that may appeare*) may not serue, where-  
with to mainteine his Heresie?

As touching the saying of Theophylact, wherwith this  
Replier would fortifie his Negatiue, it geueth euidence,  
how weake his side is, that could not be maintained by  
any sentēce of greater force thē this is, nor by any writer  
of more antiquitie, thē Theophylact is with him. Who re-  
quireth his cause to be tried by those Fathers only, that li-  
ued within the first six hūndred yeres. If he were hable to  
make any mā beleue, that the Priests of the Church haue  
at any time sacrificed beastes vnto God, or that Theophy-  
lact in that saying meant, that now there were neede of  
nothīg but of prayer only, as prayer is takē in the cōmon  
significatiō, and that al other meanes to serue God were  
needelesse: thē might the sentēce be alleged, and seeme to  
serue his turne so farr forth, as in cōsideratiō of his request  
the author were to be esteemed. But now sith Priestes of  
the new Testamēt neuer honoured God with bloudy sa-  
crifices, ād slaughter of beastes, that were foresignified to  
ceasse by our Lords driuing of the Oxē ād dooues out of  
the Tēple, ād Theophylact herevfeth no exclusiue, wher-  
by prayer alone, as it cōmōly signifieth, should be appoin-  
ted a meane wherewith to serue God: the saying was euil  
chosen, ād with smal iudgmēt put into the Replie, as that  
which nothing at al maketh agaīst the singuler, external,  
ād publike Sacrifice of the Church in myne Answer de-  
fended.

B

If M.

M. Ieruel  
to proue  
his Nega-  
tiue, at the  
first shew-  
deth no  
anciēter  
Doctour,  
thē Theo-  
phylacte  
a late  
vrriter.

Diuif.

*A Reioindre to M. Jewels Replie*

Theophyl.  
in Matth.  
cap. 21.

V what ar  
gument  
may be  
cōcluded  
out of  
Theophy  
laſt here  
alleged.

Theoſ  
phylaſte  
maketh  
for the Sa  
crifice.

Matt. 21.

Prayer.

If M. Jewel would gather arguments out of this place, thus he ought to diſpoſe them. *In that Chriſt drave the oxē and dooues out of the Tēple, he foreſignified, that there ſhould be no more nede of ſacrifices of beaſtes, or of ſlaughters, but of prayer.* So be the very wordes of Theophylaſte in Greke, ſomewhat otherwiſe, then this Replier hath translated them. Thereof it is concluded, *Ergo*, nowe in the newe Teſtament there is neede of prayer. Then further. In the newe Teſtament there is neede of prayer, But the Maſſe whereat the prieſt offereth vp Chriſt vnto his Father, is no prayer: *Ergo*, in the new Teſtament the Maſſe is needleſſe. This is the beſt Argument he can make out of Theophylaſtes wordes. In which, how ſo euer it be allowed for good, or otherwiſe, the *minor* or ſecond propoſitiō is euidently falſe, and ſo he is ſtopped frō his cōcluſion. Wherefore Theophylaſt helpeth not the mater at al.

Yea rather by the manner of his ſpeech he auoucheth the Sacrifice of the Church, vnderſtanding it by the name of prayer. For whereas by his reporte, which is expreſſed alſo in the Goſpel, Chriſt dryuing out the oxē and dooues foreſignified the ceaſing of the bloody and vncleane ſacrifices of the olde Lawe: certainly he ſhewed thereby, that a newe Sacrifice vnbloudy and pure, ſhould ſucceede in place of the olde, becauſe euery lawe hath a prieſthod and a ſacrifice peculier vnto it. Which in the newe lawe is none other, then the Sacrifice of his body and bloude conſecrated with prayer, and offered vp to God with prayer by them, who vnder Chriſt be prieſtes after Melchizedeks order. And this chiefly is that which Theophylaſte calleth prayer. For in aſmuch as this Sacrifice (due mater preſuppoſed) is cōſecrated by the Prieſt with the wordes

wordes of our Lorde, *this is my body, this is the Cuppe of my blood, &c*: whiche wordes the Fathers oftentimes name the mystical prayer: he had regarde to the fourme of the Cōsecration, and would speake, as the chiefe of the ancient Fathers haue spoken. And so the saying of Theophylacte maketh for the Sacrifice, it maketh not against the Sacrifice, as to that purpose of M. Iewel it is alleged.

Furthermore Prayer in this place may be takē not only for that which commonly we vnderstād by the name of praier (that is to say for petitiō made to God with words) but for euery such meane, as God is seruēd withal in his Church, according as it is raken in Esay the prophete alleged by Christ in the Gospel. *Domus mea domus orationis vocabitur, vos autem fecistis eam speluncam latronum*. My howse shall be called the howse of prayer, but ye haue made it a denne of theeues. So that Prayer here being set contrary to the bloudy and vncleane sacrifices of the old Lawe, signifieth al manner of seruice of God that is pure and cleane, without bloudshedding. *Ye haue made it a denne of theeues. In dennes of theeues slaughters and bloudsheddinges are made*, saith Theophylacte.

Nicolaus de Lyra writing vpō this place, saith: *Non curabāt de cultu Dei, sed magis de excoꝛiatione populi per astutias suas exquisitas*. They tooke no care for Gods seruice, but rather how by their fyne crafty sleightes they might pille the people. Here what the prophete calleth *orationē* prayer, the interpreter nameth it *cultum Dei*, the seruice or worship of God. And to this agreeth the general definition of Prayer, *oratio est mentis elenatio ad Deum*, Prayer is the lifting vp of the mynde vnto God. And because a-mōg al kindes of prayer, that, wherin, and wherby Christ

What is  
signified  
by the  
name of  
Prayer.

Matt. 21.

Lyra in  
Commēt.  
in 21. cap.  
Matt.

Praier ta-  
ken ge-  
nerally  
for the  
seruice of  
God.

Diuist.

*A Reioindre to M. Iewels Replie*

is offered vp vnto his Father, is the chiefe, therefore may Theophylact reasonably be thought in this place to haue meant that prayer, which the Church calleth the Masse.

So then by Christes driuig of the Oxē ād dooues out of the Tēple, ād by cōmēdig vnto his Church the vse of praier, this Sacrifice cā not in any wise seeme to be excluded, but rather to be brought in, as that, which beig vnbloudy ād pure, ought to succede the bloudy ād impure sacrifices of the Iewes. About the administratiō of which Sacrifice (that Theophylact may also the rather seeme to haue vnderstāded it by the name of praier) after the mind of S. Augustin, the request of S. Paule touching fundry kindes of praier is accōplished. *Obsecro igitur primū fieri obsecrationes, orationes, postulationes, gratiarū actiones p oīb<sup>9</sup> hominib<sup>9</sup>, pro regibus, & oībus, qui in sublimitate constituti sunt.* I beseeche you therfore, that aboue al thigs, supplicatiōs, praierers, intercesiōs, and geuing of thākes be made for al men, for Kings, and for al that be placed in high authoritie. To cōclude, al redoundeth to this end, that forasmuch as the special Sacrifice of the Church is made and celebrated with praier, so as it selfe be included within the general name of Praier: M. Iewel findeth no helpe in this saying of Theophylact towards the maintenāce of his Negatiue, whereby he would vtterly deface and take the Sacrifice away. Which thinge when he sawe him selfe evidently ynough, he deuised other shiftes, and saith.

Iewel.

*How be it, the old learned Fathers, as they oftentimes delited thēselues with these vwoordes, Sabbatū, Parasceue, Pascha, Pentecoste, and such other like termes of the old Law, not vvithstāding the Observatiō, and Ceremony therof vvere thē abolished, ād out of vse: Euē solikevvise thei delited thēselues oftentimes vvith these vwoordes, Sacerdos, Altare, Sacrificiū, the*  
Sacr-

August ad  
Paulinū  
epist. 59.  
1. Tim. 2.



Sacrificer, the Altar, the Sacrifice, not without adding the use thereof were the *Pachyme*  
clearly expired: only for that the eares of the people, as well of the Levites, *res. pa 401*  
as of the Gentils, had ben long acquainted with the same. Therefore *Pachy*  
meres the Paraphrase writing upon Dionysius, saith thus, Presbyterū ap- *κρίη σὺν*  
pellat Sacerdotē, vt etiā in Coelesti Hierarchia: idq; vsus iā obti- *νῆτα ἐ-*  
nuit. Him, that is the Priest, or elder, he calleth the Sacrificer, as he *Rom. 15.*  
doth also in his Coelestial Hierarchie: And the same word, Sacri- *Origen, in*  
ficer, is now obtained by Custome. In this sense S. Paul saith of him *Epist. ad*  
self, Sacrificio Euangeliū Dei: I sacrifice the Gospel of God. And *Rom. li. 10.*  
*Origē* saith, Sacrificale opus est, anūciare Euāgelii: It is a work of *Nazian.*  
Sacrifice, to Preach the Gospel. So the learned Bishop Nazianzenus in Oratio,  
saith vnto his people, Hostiam vos ipsos obtuli: I haue offered vp you *ad Plebē.*  
for a Sacrifice. So saith S. Chrysostom, Ipsum mihi Sacerdotium est, *Chryso. in*  
Prædicare, & Euāgelizare. Hāc offero oblationē: My whole priest- *Epist. ad*  
hood is, to teache, and to preache the Gospel. This is my Oblatiō, *Rom. Ho-*  
This is my Sacrifice. Thus the holy Fathers alluding to the orders, and *mil. 29.*  
Ceremonies of Moyses Law, called the preaching of the Gospel, a Sacrifice:  
not without standing in dede it were no Sacrifice.

Harding.

The effect of that hath ben said by the Replier hitherto,  
is this. The Sacrifice wherein Christ is offered up vnto his Fa-  
ther, is not appointed by God to be made by mā, for ought that  
may appere by any Clause, or Sētēce of the Scripture, but yet it  
is reported, and oftentimes spokē of by the Olde learned Fathers.  
What meaneth M. Iewel thus to teach? would he haue  
mē beleue, that the Holy Ghost the spirite of truth, who  
vsed the Prophetes, Apostles, and Euangelistes for his Se-  
cretaries to endite the Scriptures, agreeth not with the  
Holy Ghoste, that sithens their tyme hath spoken by  
the mouthes of the holy Doctours? Remembreth he not,  
they were for the more part such, as by report of S. Paule *Act. 13.*  
the Holy Ghost hath made Bishops to gouerne the Church of  
God, which he hath purchased with his bloud? If thei haue bē

B iij

made



made gouernours of the Church by the holy Ghost, may we not boldly say, they haue ben taught the truth by the holy Ghost, wherewith they might instruct the Church?

Either the  
Fathers  
were de-  
ceiued, or  
the holy  
Ghost dis-  
senteth  
frō him  
selfe, by  
M. Iewels

Verily of this doctrine one of these two must folowe. That either al the olde learned Fathers were deceiued, and taught false doctrine, or that the holy Ghost, who ruled the penne of them that endited the Scriptures, dissented from himselfe speaking in their Successours the learned Fathers. For that the Fathers either of their own heads, or of priuat inspiratiō, without al warrant of Gods worde instituted this Sacrifice: neither M. Iewel saith it, nor is it so much as to be suspected. The second, that is, that any dissension or contrarietie be ascribed to the holy Ghoste, is hainous blasphemie. The first, that al the learned Fathers should be deceiued, and also deceiue the Church, is not to be graunted. For in asmuch as they receiued the spirite of truth which Christe promised to the Apostles, and were gouerned by the spirite of God, and by the same were lead into al truth: it ought not to be thought of them in general, that they haue inclined vnto falshod, specially in so weighty a mater.

16. 11, 14.

Wherfore it standeth M. Iewel vpon, either to deny, that the olde learned Fathers haue by their ofte mention of Priestes, Aultars, and Sacrifice, acknowledged the singular Sacrifice of the Church, or recant what he said of the Scriptures, that by any clause, or sentence of them it cannot appeare, where God appointed any such Sacrifice to be made at al.

If he wil say, as he semeth to say: The Fathers confesse not, ne acknowledge nor in dede the Sacrifice it selfe, but yet ofte tymes they vse the woorde of Sacrifice, that

that is to say, they speake of it, as also of the Priestes, and  
Aulters: to that may be answered, that by their woordes  
we vnderstande their meaning. Forasmuch as they con-  
fesse it with words, and that very oft, how can we iudge  
otherwise of them, but that they beleued it also in harte?  
What, maketh he the auncient holy Fathers, Gods dere  
frendes, placed in authoritie by the holy Ghost to gouerne  
the Church of God, to be double men, such as say one  
thing, and thinke an other? Why taught they so, but that  
the Church should beleue so? If they would al men to  
beleue it, shal we say, they Beleued it not them selues?

When M. Iewel minding to mainteine his Challenge,  
had with him selfe considered this much, knowing right  
wel, as thereof he could not be ignorāt, how easy a thing  
it were for the Catholikes, to allege infinite places out of  
the olde learned Fathers for witnessse and proufe of their  
faith, and of the Churches faith cōcerning this Sacrifice:  
for some shew at least of a colorable answer to be made,  
he deuised this shift, or rather vseth a shift inuēted by the  
deuisers of this newe Gospel, in whose schoole he hath  
learned his newe diuinitie. *As the Fathers* (saith he) *deli-*  
*ted themselues with the wordes, Sabbatum, Parascene, Pas-*  
*cha, Pentecoste, and other termes of the olde Lawe, notwith-*  
*standing the obseruation and Ceremonie thereof were then*  
*abolished: so they delited themselues oftentimes with these*  
*wordes, Sacerdos, Altare, Sacrificiū, Sacrificer, Aulter, Sacri-*  
*fice, notwithstanding the vse hereof were thē clearly expired.*

This great mater is not so lightlie carried awaye M.  
Iewel. Although with force of your sworde, with your  
mattocks, and pickaxes, ye haue cut, hewed, and throwē  
downe al the holy Aulters of the Churches of Englande,  
and

A shifte  
deuised by  
the schole  
of this  
newe  
Gospel, a-  
gainst the  
manifest  
testimonies  
of  
the Fa-  
thers, for  
the Sacri-  
fice.

M. Iewel  
maketh  
the Fas-  
thers to  
speak one  
thing, ad  
to meane  
an other.

and therefore of the Churches of Christe, haue made the Synagoges of Antichrist: yet with this sclender worde of yours, ye cā not bereue the whole Church of God, of the priesthod, of the Aulters, of the Sacrifice appertaining to the newe Testament. If there be no vse of Priestes, Aulters, and Sacrifice, is it to be thought, the olde learned Fathers hartes could serue them so oftētimes to speake, and write of thē, ad to deceiue the people cōmitted to their charge, for their delite and pleasures sake? Belōged it to their grauitie, holinesse, and loue of truth, to delite and solace them selues with falshōd? to vse hypocrisie, and as it were legiērdemaine, by speaking one thing, ad meaning another? to serue Gods people with voide and empty words, as it were with pipt nuttes? Whiles they teach thē a doctrin of great importāce, to vse words that cōtein not the mater which their proper significatiō reporteth? This were crafty cistring, it were not right ad plaine teaching.

Verely we ought to iudge better of the hōly Fathers, ad to thinke, that men endued with so great grace, swarued not frō the vpright cōscience, touching the vse of termes, which one of the best lerned of thē speaketh of. Whose words be these, wherby it appereth, how rightly, warely, ad circūspectly they vsed to speake. *Nobis ad certā regulā loqui fas est, ne verborū licētia etiā de reb<sup>9</sup>, quae his significātur, impiā gignat opinionē* It is right (saith he) that we speak after a certain rule, least the ouermuch libertie of words ingēder an opiniō of the thigs, which by thē be signified.

Aug. de  
Cinit. Dei  
libr. 10.  
cap. 23.  
Vse and  
obserua-  
tiō of Sab-  
batū, Pas-  
cha, Al-  
tare etc.  
is double,  
olde, and  
newe.

But for a ful answer to you M. Iewel, where as you as-  
firme the Obseruatiō and vse of that is signified by these  
wordes, *Sabbatū, Parasceue, Pascha, Pētecoste, Sacerdos, Al-  
tare, Sacrificiū*, to be vtterly abolished, and clearly expired  
in the newe Testamēt: you seme either of ignorance not

to vnderstand, or of malice to dissemble, that the obseruation and vse of these things is of two sortes, old, and new, Legal, and Euangelical: Iewish, and Christian. The olde, Legal or Iewish Obseruation and vse of these, was clearly expired in right, by the comming of Christ, specially at what time hanging on the Crosse, and now geuing vp the ghoste, he said, *Consummatum est*, It is finished. The newe, Euangelical, and Christian obseruatiō and vse hereof, remaineth in the Church, and shall remaine so long as the Church continueth. The Iewish Ceremonie of these is quite abolished, we graūt, neither be they now in Christs Catholike Church vsed, as the Iewes vsed them. But the faithful Christiāns now kepe, vse, and celebrate their Sabbath, that is to say, their restingtide, their Parasceue, or preparingtide, cōmonly called Goodfriday, their Pascha, or Easter, their Pentecost, or Whitsontide, their Priesthood, their Aulter, their Sacrifice, in suche manner, order, sense, and meaning, as the new state and condition of the Church succeding the Iewish Synagoge, requireth: that is, not according to the figure, shadow, letter, or signification, but according to the truth, the body, the spirite, and the very thinges.

*Iesus vetus testamentum consummabat, & nouum Pascha condebat*, saith the auncient and learned Father S. Leo. Iesus made an ende of the olde Testament, and did set vp the newe Easter, or Passeouer. And this new Easter doe we kepe and celebrate. The same Father saith also: *Ut umbra cederet corpori, et cessaret imagines sub presentia veritatis, antiqua obseruantia nouo tollitur Sacramento, hostia in hostiam transit, sanguinem sanguis excludit, & legalis festinitas dum mutatur, impletur.* That the shadowes should

Ser. 7. de  
pas. Do-  
mini.

C geue



geue place to the Body, and the Images cease in presence of the Truth, the Olde Obseruance is taken away by the newe sacrament, hoste passeth ouer into hoste, bloude putteth out bloude, and the holy solemnitie of the Lawe, whiles it is chaunged, is fulfilled.

Leo Ser. 13  
de Pass.  
Domini,

Againe more plainely to this purpose in an other place. *Nihil legalium instructionum, nihil prophetiarum recedit figurarum, quod non totum in Christi sacramenta transferis. Nobiscum est Signaculum Circumcisionis, sanctificatio Chriſmatum, consecratio Sacerdotum. Nobiscum puritas Sacrificij, Baptismi veritas, honor Templi, vt meritis cessarint nunciij, postquam nunciata venerunt.* What so euer instructions be in the Lawe, what figures so euer be in the Prophetes, no iote of it departeth quite away, but is gone ouer altogether into the Sacramentes of Christe. With vs is the signet of Circumcision, the hallowing of the holy Ointements, the Consecration of Priestes. With vs is the purenesse of Sacrifice, the truth of Baptisme, the honour of the Temple: that for good cause the Messengers (that is to saie the olde lawe) ceased, after that their tidings came.

Priestesi  
Sacrifice.  
Baptisme  
Temple.

Were it not tedious, easily might a hundred such places be alledged out of the Farthers, by testimonie of which the obseruation and vse of these thinges of the olde Testament, Pascha, Easter, Pentecoste, Priest, or Sacrificer, Hoste, Aulter, and Sacrifice, is acknowleged, as of thinges translated, established, and hauing place in the newe Testament. The olde Obseruation is taken away by the newe Obseruation. For the olde Aulter that was in Salkomons Temple at Ierusalem, we haue newe Aulter in the Churches of Christians thoroughe out the whole worlde,



against the Sacrifice of the Masse.

IO

worlde, on which the members of Christ be sustained, and in which the body and bloude of Christe \* at certaine times do dwel, as the auncient Father Optatus writeth. Newe Aulters I say bicause they serue to a new purpose, and to a newe kind of Sacrifice in respect of the olde Sacrifices.

Optatus  
lib. 6.

\* Per cer-  
ra monē.

14.

Concerning the holste, for Oxen, sheepe, goates, and dooues, we haue the body and bloude of Christ. For the figuratiue Lambe, we haue the true Lambe of God, that taketh away the synnes of the worlde. For the feast of the Olde Passeouer, wherein the Iewes solemnized the memorie of the Striking Angels passing ouer them or beside them, when he destroyed al the first begoten of the Egyptians, and of their owne safe passing ouer the redde Sea out of Egypte, we haue our Passeouer or Easter, wherein we kepe a holy and solēne feast in remembrance that by the merite of Christes bloude, who is the true Lambe, the plague of euerlasting death is past ouer, and quite beside vs, that for our sake he hath conquered al power that was against vs, that he is passed ouer frō death to life, and hath translated ad redemed vs frō death and hel, to be partakers of life, ad glorie euerlasting in his kirkdō.

Ioan. 1.

Exod. 12.

1. Cor. 5.

1. Pet. 3.

1. Ioan. 3.

As the Iewes had their Pētecost, so we haue ours. For as when they were deliuered out of Egypte, the Lawe was geuē them in the Mount Sina vpon the Pentecoste, that is to say, the fiftith day after that the Lambe had be sacrificed: So vpon the fiftith day after our Passeouer, in which the true Lābe of God was slaine, the holy Ghost came down vpo the Apostles, and the cōpanie of the beleued: which holy Ghost frō that day to the end of the world cōtinueth with the Church, ad worketh in the sonnes of God the performāce of Gods holy wil by loue ad

Exod. 20.

1. Cor. 5.

Act. 2.

Matt. 28.

C ij charitie,

charitie, as the Lawe wrought it, or rather moued men to it by threates and terrour.

Leo Ser. 1.  
de Pentecoste.

& Leo speaking of this Feast, saith, *Hodiernam solennitatem in prapcipuis festis esse venerandam, omnium Catholicorum corda cognoscunt.* The hartes of al Catholike men

knowe, that the solemnitie of this day ( of Pentecoste ) ought to be had in honour among the chiefe feastes. Remember M. Iewel, if your hart geue you, that there is no such feast of Pentecost to be obserued in Christes Church, because the vse of it is expired, as you say: by whose verdite you are excluded out of the nūber of Catholike men, and so pronounced guilty. To whether parte wil you answer? Doth your harte know it, or know it not? If your harte know it not, then you are not Catholike, and therefore you ought not to be admitted to teach Gods people. If your harte knowe it, and yet ceasse not to teache the cōtrarie: then are you a dānable dissembler, and a false deceiuer. So touching this point euery way your doctrin is to be shunned. Thus then it is made cleare, the olde learned Fathers folowed not their pleasure or vaine delite, when they spake of *Sabbatū, Parascene, Pascha, Pentecoste, Priest, Altar, Sacrifice*: But vttered the truth seriously, as men ready to geue accompte of their doctrine before God and man, and as speaking of things, that haue vse and place in Christes Church, though the Iewish obseruation and Ceremonie of them be abolished.

M. Iewels  
reason re  
proued,

The reason why the Fathers vsed these termes, is, as M. Iewel saith, *onely for that the eares of the people, as well of the Iewes, as of the Gentiles had ben long acquainted with the same.* This reason is altogether without fauour. For if al manner vse and obseruatiō of the thinges by these termes signi-

thes signified were quite abolished, whereas wordes and termes serue to thende the hearers and readers by them be taught, and the Fathers in al their writings intended to teache Christe and his Lawe: what could the Iewes or Gentils learne touching the faith of Christe, hearing and reading these termes, not signifying to them the thinges which they did before their conuersion? The more acquainted their eares wer with them before, the more by hearing the same nowe were they put in minde of that they once signified. And so were they by the Fathers inuited either to returne againe to their olde Iewishnes and Paganisme, or at least to conceiue of their manner of speache, they knewe not what, those termes signifying nothing properly, that is extant, or put in practise.

This being supposed, whiche M. Iewel supposeth, that there is no real Priestthoode, no real Sacrifice, no real Aulter proper to the newe Testamente: againe this being graunted, as it is an vndoubted truth, that the Priestthoode, Sacrifice, and Aulter of the olde Lawe be abrogated, and those of the Heathens detested: what thing doth remaine for these termes properly in the newe Testamente to signifie? I say properly, For if any will replye, saying, that euery Christian man and woman is a Priest, and that contrition of harte, thanks geuing, praises, and such other the like be sacrifices, and our hartes be Aulter to offer these sacrifices vpon it may be answered, that these termes applied to such thinges, be not taken in their first and proper signification, but in a second and improper, or rather metaphorical meaning. And the thinges be so called more for a similitude, then for any proprietic.

# Diuis.

## A Reioindre to M. Iewels Replie

That the  
terme *Sas*  
*cerdos*,  
Priest, is  
vsed of  
the Fa-  
thers in  
proper  
significa-  
tion, for a  
Priest of  
the new  
Testamēt.  
August. de  
autem cum dixisset, In istis secunda mors non habet pote-  
ciunt. Dei. statem, adiunxit, atque ait: Sed erunt Sacerdotes Dei &  
lib. 20. ca. Christi, & regnabunt cum eo mille annis, non utique de so-  
10. lus Episcopus, & Presbyteris dictum est, qui proprie iam vo-  
Apoc. 20. cantur in Ecclesia Sacerdotes: sed sicut omnes Christianos  
dicimus propter mysticum Chrisma, sic omnes Sacerdotes,  
quoniam membra sunt vnius sacerdotis. De quibus Apo-  
stolus Petrus, Plebs (inquit) sancta Regale Sacerdotium.

1. Pet. 2.

Real  
Priesthood  
is in the  
Church  
now, crs  
go, real Sa-  
crifice,

If M. Iewel say, that when so euer the old learned Fa-  
thers speake of these thinges in expresse termes, they are  
to be vnderstanded metaphorically onely: he is sone co-  
futed. For auoiding tedious prolixitie, it may suffice here  
to proue the contrary in the terme *Sacerdos*, Priest, only.  
Which being proued, the like may be iudged of the rest,  
for the mutual respecte and relation, which either of the  
two other termes hath to the other, For this the au-  
thoritie of that excellent learned Father S. Augustine  
may stande vs in stede of many. Thus he saith. *Quod*  
*August. de autem cum dixisset, In istis secunda mors non habet pote-*  
*ciunt. Dei. statem, adiunxit, atque ait: Sed erunt Sacerdotes Dei &*  
*lib. 20. ca. Christi, & regnabunt cum eo mille annis, non utique de so-*  
*10. lus Episcopus, & Presbyteris dictum est, qui proprie iam vo-*  
*Apoc. 20. cantur in Ecclesia Sacerdotes: sed sicut omnes Christianos*  
*dicimus propter mysticum Chrisma, sic omnes Sacerdotes,*  
*quoniam membra sunt vnius sacerdotis. De quibus Apo-*  
*stolus Petrus, Plebs (inquit) sancta Regale Sacerdotium.*  
As touching that when the Apostle had saied: *In these*  
*the second death hath not power*, he added and saied: *But*  
*they shalbe the Priestes of God and Christe, and shal reigne*  
*with him a thousand yeres*: that is not spoken of the Bis-  
shops and Priests, who properly are now called in the  
Church *Sacerdotes*, Priestes: But as we doo call al men,  
Christians, for the mystical ointement, likewise al men,  
Priestes, because they be members of one Priest. Of  
whome the Apostle S. Peter saith, a holy people, a kingly  
Priesthood.  
Beholde Reader, S. Augustine by expresse terme auou-  
cheth, that Bishops and Priests are they, who be proper-  
ly now in the Church of God called *Sacerdotes*, Priestes,

or as



or as M. Iewel commonly for spite translateth, *Sacrificers*. Whereby it foloweth clearly, that the terme Priest, being applied to al men and wemen, who be not by a solemne sacrament ordered, not specially called and chosen to the office of a Bishop, or Priest, is taken in an improper or mystical signification. In that S. Augustin acknowledgeth the order of those to remaine nowe in the Church, which be called *Sacerdotes*, Priestes, properly: he excludeth al metaphorical, metonymical, and mystical signification of the woorde. So then folowing the doctrine of S. Augustine, a very sufficient witnessse of the faith of Christes Church, of, and before his tyme, we may boldly say: that in the Church we haue Priestes, and Priesthood, speaking properly, that is to say, a real Priesthoode, and therefore a real Sacrifice, which M. Iewel denieth.

This then being proued, that in the state of the newe Testamente there be Priestes in the proper signification of the terme beside that mystical signification, whereby al Christians be termed Priestes: this also is clearly prooued withal, that the other two termes, *Sacrifice*, and *Aulter*, properlye taken, muste remaine in the Church of Christe, and not be construed, where so euer the Fathers make mention of them, by a metaphorical or mystical vnderstanding, as though there were neither real Sacrifice, nor material Aulter. For a Priest properly taken, requireth a Sacrifice properly taken, whiche he may offer: and an Aulter properly taken, wherevpon he maye make his Sacrifice. Like as a Prieste metaphorically taken, requireth onely Sacrifice, and Aulter of like signification.

That



Christian  
me in ge-  
neral be-  
Priests af-  
ter a mes-  
taphori-  
cal mea-  
ning, not  
in proper  
speache,  
as likes  
vviſe thei  
be Kings.

That this matter be made more manifest, if it shal like thee Reader to returne againe to the place of S. Peter forementioned by S. Augustine, wherein al faithfull beleuers haue the name and title of Priestes ascribed vnto them: in the same sentence shalt thou finde them called Kinges, no lesse then Priestes. But how are they called Kinges? By a proper kinde of speache? Not so, but by a similitudo, or Metaphore. And by the same kinde of speache euery Christian persons owne body and soule, may be called his kingdom appointed him of God king of kinges to gouerne. The iurisdiction and dominion of infinite such kinges, we conceiue to be bordered and inclosed within the narrow limites of eche one person, and the subiectes to be fewer then may make a perfite number. Shal we hereof inferre, that there is nothing els in the worlde, that these termes *kinge* and *kingdom*, may and do properly signifie? Shal we hereupon dissolue Monarchies, and plainely tell such whom the worlde calleth kinges, that they haue but the Metaphoricall name of kinges, and be no kinges in deede, bereuing them of all auctoritie to rule their Subiectes, and bidding them to be content, as other meaner persons are, with their Metaphorical kingdom?

In dede this were the rediest way to bring al to confusion, and beastly enormitie, in whiche state this new Gospel might sone be set vp, or any other religion besides that the holy Ghost hath plated in the Church hitherto. And this is that state, that Luthers holy spirit would haue brought Germany vnto, and had preuailed, had not the Nobilitie resisted with al their force, the rash and wiked stourdinesse of the vulgare people. We might say,

say, and easy it were to proue, that the like confusion must ensue in the Church, if this opinion be once planted, and rooted in the hartes of the Laitie, that ech of the is as truly, and as properly a Priest, as is his Curate, his vicar, his Person, or his Bishop. But bicause this pertaineth not chiefly to the present purpose, I wil not stand about it. This which is now made euident by that is already said, may boldly be auouched: That, as there be special kinges bearing rule not only ouer them selues, yea though perhaps not ouer them selues sometimes (which may be said for some parte of them.) but at the least ouer their Subiectes: notwithstandinge that al the faithful people through Christ, whose members thei are, be made by Baptisme kinges ouer their own soules and bodies: So there be special Priestes in the newe Testament, called and appointed to that function, albeit al Christians be spiritual Priestes, as being the membes of the highest Priest Iesus Christe.

Here I thinke good to forewarne the Reader, that bicause I am constrained by the Replie to make a distinction between these two termes *Sacerdos*, and *Presbyter*, by which the persons of the highest order in the Church be called; and in our English tongue there want two distinct termes correspondent to them, the name of Priest seruing to both, as the common vse hath receiued: I wil for a fewe leaues, that my talke may be more distincte, and better perceiued, vse the terme *Sacrificer*, for the Latine worde *Sacerdos*, and the terme Priest, for the worde, *Presbyter*. When therefore I shal name a *Sacrificer*, that is to be vnderstanded; which this worde, *Sacerdos*, signifieth, and likewise *Priest* shal be that, which is signified

*Presbyter,*  
*Sacerdos,*  
*Priest, Sacrificer.*

**D**istinct

ſied by the worde *Preſbyter*. Thus I require the uſe of an vnwoont terme to be taken in good part for ſo good and profitable a cauſe. After a fewe leaues I wil returne to the uſe of the accuſtomed terme, *Prieſt*, whether the Latine, wherevnto it ſhal anſwer, be *Sacerdos*, or *Preſbyter*. And now to come againe fro whence I haue thus digreſſed.

If for the force of the former cōpariſon, M. Iewel wil cōfeſſe, that there be certaine ſpecial perſons choſen and ſent to beare in the congregatiō certaine offices, which euery man vpon the cōmiſſion of their general Priethood may not aduētūre vpon without a ſpecial cōmiſſion and appointement, and thoſe perſons be of the Fathers by an abuſe of the worde called *Sacerdotes*, *Sacrificers*, whereas in deede, and properly they are to be called *Preſbyteris*, *Prieſtes*, *Elders*, or *Ministers*: to this I reply graunting and cōfeſſing that ſuch perſons called to theſe ſpecial functions, were at the beginning, and may now alſo be called *Prieſts* and *Ministers*: But I deny vtterly, that the ſame may not, ne ought not properly to be called *Sacrificers*. Yea doubtleſſe the name of a *Sacrificer*, doth more aptly, and properly agree vnto the, the doth the terme *Prieſt*, or *Minister*. For of theſe termes the one rather declareth the age, or auncient grauitie, which is moſt ſeemely in theſe perſons, then expreſſeth their office. The other through the largenes of the ſignificatiō is ſuch, as may be applied as wel vnto Maiors of Cities, and temporal Iudges miniſtring Juſtice, as vnto thoſe perſons, that miniſter and diſpēſe the myſteries of God. But the terme *Sacrificer* doth properly extend only to thoſe, who haue auctoritie to cōſecrat the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, and be by ſpecial vocatiō miniſters and diſpenſers of moſt holy things, which miniſtratiō and diſpēſatiō is to be ſouū in the Church only.

To him

That  
there be  
nowe  
in the  
Church,  
vwho  
ought  
properly  
to be cal-  
led *Sacer-*  
*dotes*,  
that is, *Sa-*  
*crificers*.

To him that perhaps wil reply, and demaunde, why then did S. Paule, as it were of purpose shunning the terme Sacrificer, alwaies cal them Priestes, or Ministers: I answer. S. Paule had iust cause so to doe. The which cause learned men shewe to be, for that in his time the olde Law, and Priesthod of the same, was yet amōg the Iewes fresh in estimatiō, and stickte so in their cōscience, as they could not vpon the soudaine be remoued from the obseruation of their accustomed Religiō, deliuered vnto them of God by Moyse his special prophete. S. Paule therfore with other the first setters forth of Christes Law the Gospel, preaching cōtinually of the end of the old Law, and of the ceasing and abrogatiō of the Sacrifices: thought it cōuenient for a time to forbear the name of Sacrificer, and to cal the spiritual officers, by the name of *Priests* and *Ministers*, least the Iewes hearing the termes of their owne Religiō, might falsly suppose, no differēce, or preeminēce to be between the office and officers of the new, and their Religiō, that is to say, of the new, and old Testamēt. And this warenesse of speaking cōtinued vntil Ierusalē, and the Tēple it self, wher only their Sacrifices were to be made, were destroyed: at what time the kingdom, Priesthode, and rite of Sacrificing of the Iewes, was quite ended and takē away. Frō thēce forth to this time, the learned Fathers haue cōmōly without feare or doubte, resumed the termes of *Priesthod*, and *Sacrificers*, and applied thē to the spiritual ministerie and ministers of the Church. This cause being knowen and wel weighed, bewrayeth M. Iewels ignorāce, or fohe, affirming, the Fathers to haue used the termes *Sacrifice*, *Sacrificer*, and *Altar*. for that the Iewes and the Gētilseares were wel acquainted with these termes. Where as contrary wise the first Preachers of Christian Religion

VVhy S. Paule cal-  
leth them  
Priestes,  
rather  
then Sa-  
crificers.

After the  
destruc-  
tion of  
Ierusalē,  
the olde  
terme Sa-  
crificer,  
was re-  
sumed  
and vsed.



absteined from those woordes, bicause the same were vnto them vsual and familiar, least by the vse of the, some error, or inconuenience might chaunce to growe.

Answer  
to M.  
Iewels  
authori-  
ties.

Now to answer the authorities: first, whereas Pachymeres is haled in whether he wil or no, to be a witnesse in this wrong cause: let it be considered how iniurious M. Iewel is, in that he bindeth other men to Doctours, and Councils of the first six hundred yeres after Christe only, and here vseth him selfe the auctoritie of so late a writer, as Pachymeres is. And therefore sith that he hath first broken his owne Lawe, and the bonde of the couenances: we thinke it right he beare with vs, if sometime we allege Doctours, and Councils, though some deale beneath the first sixe hundred yeres, yet auncienter, and of farre better auctoritie, then Pachymeres a writer of Notes vpon S. Dionyse hath euer ben accompted of.

Next how proueth Pachymeres the purpose, for which he is brought in? Be it graunted, that S. Dionyse writing to Sopater being a *Priest*, calleth him a *Sacrificer*, and that custome hath now obtained, a *Priest*, or *Elder*, to be named a *Sacrificer*, as Pachymeres saith. what can be concluded of al this? Wil it folow hereof, that Sopater was no true *Sacrificer*, but onely a figuratiue *Sacrificer*? And that the name of a *Priest*, doth more aptly expresse the office of the stewardest of Gods Mysteries in the Church, then doth the terme *Sacrificer*? Nothing lesse. This is it only that wil folow, that the dispensatours of those spiritual treasures were called by both the names of a *Priest*, and of a *Sacrificer*, euen from the beginning of the Church, a shorte time only excepted, vntil the Iewish Synagogue was buried, and almost forgottē. After which time,



time, the Ecclesiastical writers were accustomed to attribute vnto the chiefe ministers of Gods mysteries as oft (or oftener) the title of *Sacrificers*, as of *Priests*, or *Elders*, as it may be tried by vewe of the workes written by S. Dionyse, Tertullian, S. Cyprian, S. Chrysostom, S. Ambrose, S. Hierome, S. Augustine, S. Leo, S. Gregorie, and briefly by the writings of al others, from age to age, vnto these wretched times, when the name and person of a *Sacrificer*, which al good men of times past euer reuerenced and honoured, is despised, accompted Iewish or Heathenish, hated and detested. So that the custome, which Pachymeres speaketh of, to cal a *Priest* a *Sacrificer*, is now toward the ende of the worlde, when Antichrist shal come, by the worst sort of men his forerunners, interrupted and broken.

How be it I maruel, that M. Iewel, who hath so great stoare of phrales, wherewith to make shew of somewhat against the Catholiks, and to bleare the eyes of the vnlearned, had no better phrase, then this of S. Dionyse, against the Sacrifice of the Church. Wil it seme likely to any wise man, that S. Dionysius was so farre ouerseene, as to vse one word for an other, specially in that place, where he so earnestly aduertiseth one *to utter nothing that may be reprobud*? For that special counsel he geueth Sopater in that Epistle. And whereas writing Epistles to others, he geueth to ech one his due title of honour and calling, as, *To Gaius* a \* *Moonke*, *To Dorothe* a \* *Minister*, or *Deacon* by interpretation of Pachymeres, *To Polycarpus* a \* *Bishop*, *To Iohn the Diuine*, *Apostle*, and *Euangelist*: how shal we think he failed only of the true name, that Sopaters vocation was called by? Verily had not a *Priest* in his certaine

S. Dionysius writing to Sopater a Priest, calleth him a sacrificer.   
 ὡς πᾶν ἡ  
 εἶναι ἀ-  
 νεξέλεσ-  
 τα τὰ λι-  
 γόμενα.  
 \* ἱερα-  
 πιντη.  
 \* λειτούρ-  
 γος.  
 \* ἱεράρχη

knowledge, and in the iudgemēt of the learned Fathers of that time the Apostles scholars, don true Sacrifice in dede by offering vp the body and bloud of Christe vnto God, he wold not haue called Sopater the *Priest* a *Sacrificer*. But bicause they had the same faith concerning this Sacrifice, that the Church euer sithens had, and we nowe haue: he doubted not to cal a *Priest* a *Sacrificer*, as now he is comōly called. Neither vsed he that terme only in his Epistle to Sopater, but also in his Ecclesiastical Hierarchie, where he declared the maner how the Sacrifice was to be celebrated. *And the custome hath now so preuailed*, saith Pachymeres. Which custome should neuer so haue preuailed in the vniuersal Church of Christe, had not the terme in so weighty a mater bene agreable vnto the truth. Thus S. Dionyse, whom M. Iewel allegeth for him selfe, maketh clearely against M. Iewel.

Vnto Pachymeres M. Iewel adioineth S. Paule, Origen, S. Chrysostome, to proue that preaching of the Gospel is called a Sacrifice, being none in dede, and also S. Gregorie Nazianzene, calling the people, his Sacrifice. These authorities might as wel haue ben brought in to proue, that Christe offered no true and real Sacrifice vpon the Crosse, as that there is no external Sacrifice in the Church, but only a reported Sacrifice by a metaphore. For if any man allege to the contrarie, the testimonies of the Scripture and Doctors, wher they cal Christes death a Sacrifice, folowing M. Iewel one may easly answere, that both the Scripture and Doctors vsed the word improperly, alluding for their delite vnto the Sacrifices of the old Law. For behold, saith he, this is not strāge. S. Paul, S. Chrysostome, and Origē doe cal preaching a Sacrifice,  
 whereas

whereas in dede preaching is no Sacrifice. And so by a phrase of speache the Sacrifice of Christes death, whereon our faith and hope, as the ground of our saluatiō stayeth, were like to be remoued and displaced.

What a fond kind of arguing is this? The terme, *Sacrifice*, is sometimes vsed of the Fathers speaking metaphorically: *Ergo* it is so to be taken, when they speake of the Sacrifice of the Auker. The great absurditie of this argumēt may easily appeare in the like. As for example. Baptisme is somtime taken in the Scripture by a figuratiue speach, for tribulatiō and suffering of death, as when Christ said, *Baptisma habeo baptizari, et quomodo coartor, usque dū perficiatur?* I haue a Baptisme to be baptized withal, and how am I straighted, vntil it be accomplished? *Ergo* Baptisme hath no proper significatiō in the last chapter of S. Matthew, where Christ gaue cōmandemēt vnto his disciples, saying, *Go ye and teach al natiōs, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Sonne, and of the holy Ghost:* But Christ pronouncing the terme of Baptisme, alluded only vnto the obseruāce and Ceremonie of the Iewes, whose custome was, to baptize and walke them selues, when they returned home from the market or common place. For thy better instruction herein Reader, thou maist be aduertised, that these Argumentes à *Simili*, from one like thing to an other, be the weakest of al others, and most deceiueable, and are fitter for a Rhetorical declamation, then for a probation of truth called in controuerse. And therefore it is a kinde of Argument attributed vnto the Rhetorician, to explicate and make plaine a mater, and not to the Logician, strongly to conuince, and piththily to proue a veritie. Yet M. Iewel

The absurdity of M. Iewels argumēt.

Luc. 21.

Mat. 28.

Mat. 7.

M. Iewels comō Arguments deduced from like to like,

not.

notwithstanding is so in loue with this kinde of prouing in his whole booke of Replie, that if his comparisons of one phrase with an other were cut of, which he would haue seme to be like: the rest of his booke should appeare of smal quantitie.

How be it, though it be the slipperest way in reasoning, yet if M. Iewel had compared phrases together, that were like in dede, al circumstances obserued, he were the more to be borne withal. But most comonly he maketh his comparisons betwixt those phrases, that haue litle, or none affinitie at al, either for that the one is spoken by a Metaphore, and the other properly: or the one of one mater, and the other of an other: or the one in one respect, the other in an other. And by that meanes he confoundeth the Doctours sayinges, and thinketh he hath done the parte of a lerned man, if he may seme to foile, and desplace one truth by an other truth. As for example. In our present case, bicause S. Paule, and certaine Doctours by a Figure do take Preaching for a Sacrifice, which is a truth denied by no man, for it is in deede a kinde of spiritual Sacrifice: therefore he would haue it seme, that the same Doctours neuer speake of any real Sacrifice of Christes body and bloude, whereas it is most manifest (as it shal hereafter be proued) that they speake of both kindes of these Sacrifices, and both may well stand together.

M. Jewels  
custome,  
to put a  
vway one  
truth by  
an other.

Rom. 15.  
Origen in  
Epist. ad  
Ro. lib. 10.

Where he saith, *S. Paule speaketh of him self in this sense saying, Sacrificio Euangelium Dei, I sacrifice the Gospel of God, and Origen, Sacrificale opus est annunciare Euangelium, It is a worke of Sacrifice to preach the Gospel: What sense meaneth he? or what sense would he his Reader to conceiue,*

conceiue, sith that he spake no worde of any sense before? He spake onely of a certaine delite, that the olde learned Fathers had in vsing wordes, which after the promulgation of the Gospel, signified nothing extant nor practised. I trow therefore he meant, that S. Paule had also that delite, which he pretendeth. Now true it is, that S. Paule hath nowhere these very wordes, *Sacrifico Euangelium Dei*, I sacrifice the Gospel of God. Neither be the woordes Origenes, that he ascribeth to Origen, but S. Hieromes, who added vnto, and tooke from Origenes fifteen vnperfite bookes vpon the Epistle to the Romans, and disposed that whole worke, as he thought best, as it appeareth by his Epistle to Heraclius.

The place which he meaneth, is, *ἡμεῖς προεργαζόμεθα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ*, for which the common Latine bookes haue, *sanctificans Euangelium Dei*, Erasmus, *administrans*, S. Augustine, *consecrans*, which worde liketh Caluine, and the same he preferreth before Erasmus worde, whiche notwithstanding the translatours of the Englishe newe Testament folowed. Al which interpretations be too obscure, as Beza iudgeth, and therefore he liketh his owne best, *Operans Euangelio Dei*, as his Maister Caluine liked his owne better, then that of Erasmus. S. Hierome confesseth it to be more highly, and with a more magnificēce spoken in Greke, then he was hable fully to expresse in Latine. Yet as being destitute of a fuller and perfiter worde, he turneth the Greke worde, *ἡμεῖς προεργαζόμεθα*, into *sacrificans*, and saith, that *to preach the Gospel, is a sacrificing worke*, and there plainly declareth how.

Rom. 15.

Beza in Annot. in no. test.

Now though it be graunted, that both S. Paule alluded to the manner and condition of the Sacrifices of

E

Moyſes



Moyſes lawe, and S. Hierome conſidered the ſame in his expoſition of that place: yet thereof it wil not followe, that when ſo euer the olde Learned Fathers ſpeake of the external, viſible, and ſingular Sacrifice of the Church, they meane that there is no real Sacrifice in deede, but onely in a figuratiue ſpeache.

M Iewell  
for the  
moſt part  
ſo argu-  
eth, that  
he impug-  
neth one  
truth by  
an other  
truth.

This Argument is naught pardy, as M. Iewel knoweth him ſelfe, S. Paule ſaith, he conſecrated the Goſpel as it were a Sacrifice, throughe preaching of the ſame offering vp the beleeuers as Hoſtes vnto God: Item, Saint Hierome for that reſpecte, calleth preaching of the Goſpel a ſacrificing worke: Ergo, the Fathers woordes ſpoken of the daily Sacrifice of the Church, are to be taken metaphorically onely, and not properly. Bothe manners of ſayinges be true in their right ſenſe, the one in figuratiue, the other in proper ſenſe.

Who ſo euer aunſwereth M. Iewel, he muſt alwaies ſing one ſong vnto him, that his continual ſhift is, to impugn one truth by an other truth. The ſame answer ſerueth to the places by him alleged out of S. Gregorie Nazianzen, and S. Chryſoſtome: if S. Nazianzen haue any ſuch wordes at al. For amongſt al his Orations that be extant, none beareth the title that is here noted in the margent. Yet I acknowledge them to be ſuch, as he might wel haue ſpoken them

M. Iewell  
faſtiſieth  
S. Chry-  
ſoſtome

by a meraphore. The Teſtimonie of S. Chryſoſtome he hath fully falſified with vntue translation. For whereas he found theſe wordes in S. Chryſoſtome, *Ipfum mihi Sacerdotium eſt predicare & Euangelizare*: he hath thus trans-

translated it into English, *My whole priesthoode is, to teach, and to preach the Ghospel.* As though *ipsum* in Latine, signified, *whole* in English, and as though it were true, that S. Paules Priestthode consisted wholly and altogether in preaching the Ghospel, whereas he confesseth him selfe to haue baptized Crispus, and Caius, and the householde of Stephana: and it is not to be doubted, but he consecrated and ministred also the blessed Sacrament of Christes body and bloude, and where occasion so required, loosed and retained synnes.

1. Cor. 14.

Which three functions be diuerse from the preaching of the Ghospel. Whereby it is cleare, that S. Paules whole Priestthode consisted not in preaching.

But these men would faine inclose al Priestly office within the limittes of preaching. For so should our whole Religion consist in prating, so few Sacramentes would serue, so the continual Sacrifice should cease, so should Hostlers, and Tapsters occupie the Pulpittes, and what other so euer lewd lackes could chatte and chapter their matters, they should be admitted to the gouernement of soules. And thus thinke they, Papistrie should quit be throwen doune, and their glorious Ghospel be set vp.

But S. Chrysostomes meaning was, vpon occasion of S. Paules worde *ἡγευσθῆναι*, whereby he signified the excellencie of his Office, deducing his talke from the inferiour and common terme, *Latria*, that apperteineth to al, whereof he spake in the beginning, to termes of an higher and more speciall dignitie, to wit, *Liturgia*, and *Hierurgia*, which import Priestly Office: his meaning I say, was partely to declare, that S. Paules

Rom. 15.

Chrysoſto.  
in epiſt. ad  
Romanos  
homil. 29.

1. Cor. 1.

preaching was a certaine Priesthode, forasmuche as by the same he offered vp those that beleued, as a sacrifice vnto God, their outwarde man killed, and carnal affecti- ons quite mortified, for which cause he calleth the Gos- pel his sworde, *Machera mea Euangelium est*, the Gospel, which is the worde of preaching, is my sworde: partely also to signifie, that of al other offices and dueties, the chiefe function of S. Paules Priesthode was, to preach the Gospel, according to that him selfe witnesseth, *Non misit me Christus baptizare, sed euangelizare*: Christe sent me not to baptize, but to preache. Which wordes The- phylacte expounding, wherein he foloweth the vaine of S. Chrysostome, saith expressely, that although the Apostle were not sent specially to baptize, yet he was not forebidden to take that office vpon him.

M. Iewel not being ignorant of al this, I see not what he can pretend for any colorable excuse of his false trans- lation, specially directed to so wicked an ende, as of him it is: which is, either quit to abolish the external and true Priesthode of the newe Testament, or to abridge it one- ly to a bare preaching of Gods wordes, al other functi- ons therevnto belonging, as to baptize, to loose and binde synnes, to consecrate and offer vp to God the bo- dy and bloude of Christe, to minister the other Sacra- mentes, and the like, clearely excluded.

Thus I hope, thou perceiuest Reader, what miserable and shameful an entrie M. Iewel hath ben driue to make, to come to his purpose, whiche was to impugne the most worthy and healthful Sacrifice of Christes body and bloude, and to persuaue vnlearned soules, there is no such Sacrifice really offered vnto God by Priestes of the

the newe Testament. Wherevpon I haue stayd some what the lenger, because I sawe, how by guileful persuasions he went about to engraft at the beginning in the myndes of the vnlearned, First, that man for cause of his miserable and mortal condition, ought not to presume to offer vp the Immortal Sonne of God in a real Sacrifice vnto his Father: nexte, that by Scripture there appeareth no graunt of auctoritie or warrant, so to doo: lastly, that the termes *Sacrificer*, *Sacrifice*, and *Aulter*, be onely naked and empty termes, void of any substance signified that is in the Church, as deriued out of the Lawe of Moyse, and vsed by the olde learned Fathers for their delite. Al which three pointes, how farre wyde they be from truth, it may partely appeare by that I haue already said, and shal more fully appeare in the processe of this Reioindre. Now let vs heare M. Iewel.

The summe of M. Iewels shiftes against the Sacrifice.

*Iewel.*

*Nowre, to comme to M. Hardinges woordes, Three waies, saith he, Christ is offered vp vnto his Father, In a Figure, as in the Olde Lawe: In Deede, and Blouddily, as vpon the Crosse: In a Sacrament, or Mysterie, as in the Newe Testament. Of voblie the three waies, the Blouddy Oblation of Christe vpon the Crosse, is the very, true, and onely Propitiatorie Sacrifice for the Sinnes of the worlde. The other two, as in respecte, and manner of Signifying, they are sundrie, so in effecte, and substance, they are al one. For, like as in the Sacramentes of the olde Lawe was expressed the Death of Christe, that was to comme: Euen so in the Sacramentes of the newe Lawe of the Gospell, is expressed the same Death of Christe already paste. As wee haue Mysteries, so had they Mysteries: As wee Sacrifice Christe, so did they Sacrifice Christe: As the Lambe of God is slaine.*

Diuif. t.

*A Reioindre to M. Iewels Replie.*

August. De  
utilitate  
penitent.  
cap. 1.

August. in  
Ioannem  
tract. 26.

unto vs, So was the same Lambe of God slaine unto them. 3. Augustine saith, Tunc Christus Venturus, modò Christus Venit. Venturus, & Venit, diuersa verba sunt: sed idem Christus. Then was, Christe shal comme: Nowe is, Christe Is comme. Shall comme, and, Is comme, are sundrye woordes. But Christe is al one. Againe in like comparison by the same the Lawe of Moyses, and the Gospel of Christe, he saith thus: Videte, Fide manente, Signa variata. In Signis diuersis eadem Fides. Beholde, the Faith remaininge, the (Sacramentes, or) Signes are changed. The Signes, or Sacramentes beinge diuers, the Faith is one.

*Harding.*

Now then that after your Preface you come to my woordes M. Iewell, what haue you to replye against them, that to any learned man may seeme to be to the purpose? I said, Christe is offered after three manners, figuratiuely, truly with bloodshedding, and sacramentally, or in Mysterie. With which parte of this threefold Diuision finde you fault? As for the two first partes, they be clearely proued by the Scriptures. The third is that ye call in question, and whiche you impugne. Because you had nothing to say against the two first, least your mater should seeme to haue a foile, if you yelded to any thing that were by me said, were it neuer so true: you goe from the purpose, and enter into other talke. Whereof as parte is false, so the whole is impertinent. What nede was there to tel vs, that the bloudy Oblation of Christe vpon the Crosse, is the Propitiatorie Sacrifice for the sinnes of the worlde? As thereof no man doubted, so no man spake of it.

M. Iewell  
diuerteth  
from the  
purpose to  
impertinēt  
mater.

The point now treated, is not, whether the Sacrifice



crifice of the Crosse be Propitiatorie, for it were superfluous thereof to dispute: but whether Christe be now offered vp in Mysterie. Graunt that first, and afterward we may procede further, to discusse whether the Sacrifice of the Aulter be Propitiatorie, and in what sense it be Propitiatorie.

Of what effecte and substance so euer the Sacrifices of both Lawes be, how so euer the Death of Christe to come, or past, be expressed in the olde and newe Sacramentes, that they of the olde Testament, as wel as we, had Mysteries, of the equalitie, and likenesse of Sacrifices, and of like slaiyng of the Lambe of God on their parte, and ours: of all these thinges so particularly to speake, the Diuision by me declared ministred you no iuste occasion. And al this might wel be suffred to go vnanswered, as impertinent, had you not by the way as it were spitten forth some poison of erroneous doctrine, to the infection of the vnlearned and vnware Readers.

For by calling the bloody Oblation of Christe vpon the Crosse the very, true, and onely Sacrifice Propitiatorie for the synnes of the worlde (which no man denieth) your meaning is to insinuate, that the vnbloudy Sacrifice, which Christe instituted at his last Supper of his body and bloude, were not in dede a Sacrifice in any sense or respecte Propitiatorie. Whereas if that of the Crosse was Propitiatorie, the other must nedes be Propitiatorie, though in a diuers degree of Propitiation, bicause in substance of the thing offered it is one with the other, but diuers in the manner of offering, as being vnbloudy, and done in a mysterie, and the other bloudy, and don in the forme of a visible body. And the force and  
vertue.

Diuif. t.

*A Reioindre to M. Jewels Replie.*

*Cyprianus de cæ. Do.* vertue of Propitiation of the one, issueth not from the Priest, but from the Propitiation of the other, in whose cōmemoration it is offered. Verely S. Cyprian sticketh not to cal the holy Euchariste, *Medicamentum ad sanandas infirmitates, & holocaustum ad purgandas iniquitates*. A medicine to heale sickeneses, and a wholeburnt Sacrifice to cleanse iniquities. S. Basile also in his Liturgie making his supplication, saith thus. *Da Domine, ut pro nostris peccatis, & populi ignorantijs, acceptum sit Sacrificium nostrum*. Graunt Lorde, that our Sacrifice may be acceptable for our sinnes, and for the ignorances of the people.

*Basilius in Liturg.*

Three vntruthes vttered at once by M. Ieuvel

Whereas you affirme the other two waies, after which Christe is offered, that is to say, the Sacrifices of the olde Lawe, and the singular Sacrifice of the Church now, to be one in effecte, and substance, as they are sundrye in respecte, and manner of signifiyng: you vtter three greate vntruthes at once. For first, as concerning the respecte of signifiyng, in our Sacrifice the formes of Breade and Wine doo signifie the Bodie and Bloude of Christe, as the Sacrifices of the olde Lawe signified Christe. And although they signifie Christ present, and the other absent: yet in respecte of signifiyng they agree, and therefore are not sundry therin. The respect of signifiyng is one, and the thing signified is one, though the manner of signifiyng be diuers.

That the substance of the Sacrifices of both testaments is diuers.

Secondly, touching the substance, it is diuers in the Sacrifices of both Testaments. For the substance of the olde Sacrifices was a brute beaste, meale, cakes, oile, wine, and such the like. But the substance of our Sacrifice nowe frequented in the newe Testament, is the Body

Body and Bloud of Christ. So both the Scripture tea- *Luc. 22.*  
 cheth, shewing how Christe hauing at his supper conse-  
 crated his body and bloude, commaunded his disciples to  
 doe the same that he had done in his remembrance, and  
 S. Augustine declareth in these woordes. *Hoc est quod* *August. in*  
*dicimus, quod modis omnibus approbare contendimus, Sacri-* *lib. senten.*  
*ficiū Ecclesie duobus confici, duobus constare, visibili elemē-* *Prosperi.*  
*torum specie, & inuisibili Domini nostri Iesu Christi corpore*  
*& sanguine, & sacramento, & re Sacramenti.* This is that  
 we say, that by al meanes we earnestly endeouour to ap-  
 proue, that the Sacrifice of the Church is made of two  
 thinges, and doth consist of two thinges, of the visible  
 forme of the Elementes, and of the inuisible body and  
 bloude of our Lorde Iesus Christ, of the Sacrament, and  
 of the thing of the Sacrament (that is to wit, of the body  
 of Christe).

S. Ireneus agreeably to this doctrine, saith, the Eucha- *Irene. lib.*  
 riste to consist of two thinges, the one earthly, where- *4. 64. 34.*  
 by he meaneth the forme of the elementes, the other  
 heauenly, that is to say, the body and bloud of Christe.

Learne Reader by this doctrine of S. Augustine, that the substance of bread and wine, which be called here the Elements, hath no place in our Sacrifice, which doth consist of two partes, the one visible, the other inuisible. The formes of the Elementes be the visible parte. As for the substance of bread and wine, it is vtterly inuisible. But the inuisible parte of the Sacrifice, is the body and Bloud of Christ. And therefore onlesse we appoint two inuisible partes of this Sacrifice, that is to say, the substance of bread and wine, and also the body and bloud of Christe, (which were absurde to thinke) it must nedes be confessed,

The substance of bread and wine hath no place in our Sacrifice.

essed, that no place is here lefte for the substance of bread and wine: but that the inuisible thing or substance of the Sacrament and likewise of the Sacrifice is the body and blood of Christe. And thus it is euident, that the substance of the Sacrifices of the olde Law, and of the Sacrifices of the new Law is sundry and diuerse. Wherof it is concluded, that it is either ignorantly and grossely, or heretically said if it be stubbornly mainteined, that our Sacrifice is one in substance with the Iewish Sacrifices.

The effects of the Sacrifices of both Lawes be differēt and diuers.

Now thirdly to speake of the effect of the Sacrifices of the olde Lawe, and of the Sacrifice of the Church, wherein Christ is offered vp vnto his Father in a Sacrament and mystically, to wit vnder the forme of bread and wine: certaine it is, the effectes be diuers. To declare fully the manyfolde and heauenly effectes of our Sacrifice; farre surmounting any effecte that euer was ascribed to the Sacrifices of the olde Lawe, it would require a long treatise. The difference of both may sufficiently appeare by comparing two or three of their effectes together.

The bloude of the Sacrifices of the olde Lawe confirmed the same Lawe. The bloude of our Sacrifice confirmeth the newe Testamente. *Math. 26. Hic est Sanguis meus novi Testamenti*, this is my bloude of the newe Testamente, saith our Lorde in the Gospel. Howe much diuersitie then is betwene the newe Testament and the olde (which is incomparably great, the new Law passing in excellencie the olde) so much differeth, and so far surmounteth the effect of the Sacrifice of Christes Church, the effecte of the Sacrifices of the Iewish Synagogue.

Againe

Againe, to vse your owne witnesse against your selfe, by reporte of Saint Augustine, the olde Sacrifices signified in Figures Christes death to come, and to be suffered. But the Sacrifice of the Church, representeth with the real presence of that body which hath dyed, the death already past and perfited. And who knoweth not, what difference there is betwene a promise, and the performance of the promise? Performance I say, for although in our Sacrifice the death of Christe be not performed a new, and againe suffered: yet in the same is the truth of that very body inuisibly present, which by suffering death hath payd the price of our Redemption. In consideration whereof S. Augustine speaking of this Sacrifice offred vnto God for that blessed woman S. Monica his mother at her burial, whereby he meaneth the Masse, calleth it *Sacrificium pretij nostri*, the Sacrifice of our Price, that is to say, wherewith our Raunsome was payd.

Augustin.  
Confes. lib.  
9. cap. 12.

S. Ignatius ascribeth to our Sacrifice of a faithful person worthily receiued, a maruelous effecte, calling it *φάρμακον ἀθανασίας, ἀντίδοτον τοῦ μη ἀποθανεῖν*, a medicine of immortalitie, and a preseruatiue whereby we may be kepte from dying. Which maruelous benefite who euer attributed to the Sacrifices of the olde Lawe? Other the like effectes which the olde learned Fathers haue ascribed vnto the blessed Sacrifice, be many in number, and great in excellencie, of which the olde Sacrifices were neuer hable to worke any. Wherefore you ought to recant this your false doctrine M. Iewel, that the Sacrifices of both Lawes be of one effecte, or which is the same, one in effecte.

Ignatius  
in epist. ad  
Ephesios.



No lesse false is that you affirme, that *as we haue My-  
series, so had they Myseries*, specially yf your worde  
of comparison imply a likenes and equalitie of Myste-  
ries, as the purport of your other doctrine leadeth vs  
to iudge of you. For although it be true, that they had  
Myseries, and we also haue Myseries: yet had not  
they the like Myseries, nor equal in dignitie, truth, and  
plaineesse, to our Myseries and Sacramentes. Howe  
much ours are preferred before theirs in the iudgemente  
of S. Augustine, it is euident by that he saith speaking  
of bothe. *Mutata sunt Sacramenta, facta sunt facilia,  
pauciora, salubriora, felicia*. The Sacramentes (saith he)  
be chaunged, they be made easier, fewer, healthfuller,  
happier. And in the same place: *Sacramenta noui Te-  
stamenti dant Salutem, sacramenta veteris Testamen-  
ti promiserunt Saluatorem*. The Sacramentes of the  
newe Testamente geue saluation, the Sacramentes of  
the olde Testamente promised the Sauour. Where-  
fore M. Iewel either make vs beleue, that you are to be  
heard before S. Augustine, and that better is worse, and  
worse better: or reuoke your woordes, by which you  
teache likenes and equalitie betwene the Myseries and  
Sacramentes of both Testaments.

M. Iewvel  
utterly ta-  
keth a-  
vay the  
real Sa-  
crifice of  
the new  
Testamēt.

Where you say further, that *as we Sacrifice Christe,  
so did they Sacrifice Christe*: you vterly take away the  
Real Sacrifice of the newe Testamente. Wherein being  
a very weighty point, you dissent from the Catholike  
Church, for which you and your felowes be condēned  
of the Church, and holden for Heretiks. This haue I au-  
ouched, and sufficiently proued in myne Aunswere  
to this. 17. Article of your Challenge. What you reply  
against

against the same, here in the proceſſe of this Reioindre by Gods grace I ſhal confute. To make your vntrue and heretical ſaying appeare the more tollerable to the vnlearned, you ioine vnto it a ſaying, that in a righte conſtruction may be admitted. *As the Lambe of God is ſlaine vnto vs (ſay you) ſo was the ſame Lambe of God ſlaine vnto them.* In deede if you meane a newe actual ſleying of Chriſt, who is the true Lambe of God, he is not now in the daily Sacrifice of the Church ſlaine, no more then he was ſlaine in the daily ſacrifices, or in the yerely Paſſeouer of the Iewes. But for aſmuch as in our daily Sacrifice we haue the true Body and Bloude of the Lambe of God, that taketh away the ſinnes of the worlde, laid vpon the holy table (which is the Aulter) ſacrificed of Priſtes *ἑθέρως*, as the Nicen Councel ſaith, that is to ſay, without killinge and bloudſhed. In conſideration hereof, you ſhould not haue ſaied, *as we ſacrifice Chriſt, ſo did they ſacrifice Chriſt.* For though in our Sacrifice we ſley not Chriſt, the true Lambe of God, as they ſlewe the Lambes, which prefigured Chriſt: yet ſo farre as that is true, which the Fathers of the Nicen Councel reporte, and as by vertue of Chriſtes almighty wordes according to his commaundement and Inſtitution his Body and Bloud are conſecrate, and really preſent: we offer vp Chriſte in deede vnto God in the Sacrifice of the Church. Ioan, 1.

For proufe of the real preſence, I referre the Reader, who vnderſtanderh not the Latine tongue, to ſundry learned workes written in the Engliſhe tongue in our time therof. In which he ſhal finde the mater ſo largely, ſo clearely, and ſo ſubſtantially proued, that he ſhal

confesse he seeth the same, onlesse he wil as some doo, wilfully blindefolde him self, and say in midday, it is darke night. Forasmuch then as we sacrifice Christ truely, bicause we haue and offer vp in our sacrifice the truth of the body and Bloude of Christ in deede present by th' almighty power of his owne worde, after which sorte the Iewes had not Christ present: therefore it is not true that you say, that as we sacrifice Christe, so did they sacrifice Christe.

Diuers  
site in the  
Sacra-  
mentes  
of both  
Lawes.

Touching the comparison you make between the Sacramentes of both Lawes (for now soudeinly you chop from the Sacrifices into the Sacramentes) in expressing Christes death then to come, and nowe paste, whereby you go about to proue the equal valewe of both Sacramentes: notwithstanding that both do expresse or signifie (though in diuers degree) the death of Christ, yet doth our Sacrament of the Aulter farre surmount theirs, bicause in ours is conteyned the very body and bloude of Christ, in theirs was nothing but a figure, in theirs the shadow, in ours the body.

Aug. de  
Vtilitate  
Peniten-  
tie.

The place you allege out of the booke *de utilitate Penitentiae*, that you attribute to S. Augustine contrary to the censure of Erasmus, serueth you to no purpose. We agree vnto it no lesse then your selfe. In that place the authour speaketh of the spiritual meate, which the Iewes did eate, the same as we do. And that meate he wil both to be Christ, teaching how they did eate Christe, whom we do eate. The whole processe there is to be vnderstanded of the spiritual eatinge, for so he saith. *Quicumque in Manna Christum intellexerunt, eundem quem nos cibum spiritalem manducauerunt.*

Qui-

*Quicumque autem de Manna solam saturitatem quasierunt, patres infidelium, manducauerunt & mortui sunt. Sic etiam eundem potum: Petra enim Christus. Eundem ergo potum, sed spiritalem, id est, qui fide capiebatur, non qui corpore hauriebatur.* Who so euer in the Manna vnderstoode Christe, they did eate the same spiritual meate that we eate. But who so euer sought onely to fil their bellies by eating Manna, being the Fathers of the vnfaithful, they did eate, and dyed. So likewise they dranke the same drinke. For the Rocke was Christe. And therefore the same drinke which we drinke, they dranke, but spiritual, that is to say, whiche was receiued by faith, not that whiche was taken in by the body.

Now what though Christe, whome both the Iewes and we do eate spiritually, be one spiritual meate, one Christe, and likewise one spiritual drinke, as he is eaten and dronken with spiritual eating and drinking? Shal that therefore whiche, we receiue in our Sacrament by sacramental eating and drinking vnder the formes of bread and wine, be no better, then that which they did eate and drinke in the ceremonie of their Sacramentes? Christe that was to come, and Christ that now is come, is one Christe, thereof who doubteth? And though the wordes *shal come*, and *is come*, be sundry, yet Christe is one, Christe is not sundred with diuision of times.

And this is al that the auctour meant, wherein lyeth no controuerisie betwixte vs. But that you woulde proue, and can not proue, and we vtterly denye, is this, that the thing and substance of the Sacramentes of  
both

both Lawes be not sundry, but one and the same, and of equal worthines. We receiue Christ both sacramentally, to wit, his true and real body and bloude in the Sacrament of the Aulter vnder the formes of bread and wine, and also spiritually, that is to say, by faith. They receiued him only spiritually, bicause in Manna they vnderstode Christ. The like is to be sayd of the water, that flowed out of the Rocke which they dranke, in comparison of the very bloude of Christe, which we drinke, not onely spiritually, but also sacramentally, and in deede vnder the forme of wine mingled with water, which bloude is the true water of life, the same that issued out of our Lordes body the true Rocke, after it was stricken with the Rodde, that is to say, after that the Crosse came vnto it. For in figure thereof the olde Rocke was stricken with woode, and not with Iron, *quia Crux ad Christum accessit, ut nobis gratiam propinaret*, bicause the Crosse came vnto Christ, that it might \* brince his grace vnto vs, as saith S. Augustine, or who so euer was the author of that booke.

Exod. 15.  
Aug. Tractat.  
Statu de  
utilitate  
Penitentia.  
\* Propinaret.

M. Iewels  
forgeth  
sayings  
of his  
owne, faste  
thering  
them vpon  
the  
Doctours

The other place that you pretende to allege out of S. Augustine, *In Iohannem Tractat. 26.* is soone answered: where so euer it be, it is not there. Thus to forge sayings of your owne, and to beare your Reader in hande, it is S. Augustines, or any other learned Fathers, is a very false parte, and such as must nedes much discredit you, when it is detected against you. And yet by such false dealing you, and your felowes haue begyled many vnlearned and vnstable soules. How be it if it were S. Augustines, or any other auncient Doctours saying, it forced nothing. For true it is, the signes or sacramentes of  
the



the newe Testament, be diuerse from the sacramentes of the olde Testament: the faith notwithstandinge is not changed, bicause Christ signified by the signes or sacramentes of both, being that which faith reacheth vnto, remaineth one and the same. Let vs see whether your other stufte be any better.

Jewel.

But here hath M. Hardinge donne greatte, and open vvronge vnto S. Augustine, vvilsfully suppressing, and drovving his vvoordes, and uncourtously commaunding him to silence in the middest of his tale. VVherein also appeareth some suspicion of no simple dealing. S. Augustines vvoordes touchinge this vvhole mater, are these: In illis carnalibus Victimis Figuratio fuit Carnis Christi, quam pro nobis fuerat oblaturus, & Sanguinis, quem erat effulusus in Remissionem peccatorum: In isto autem Sacrificio Gratiarum actio est, & Commemoratio Carnis Christi, quam pro nobis obtulit, & Sanguinis, quem pro nobis idem Deus effudit. In illis Sacrificijs, quid nobis esset donandum, Figuratè significabatur: In hoc autem Sacrificio, quid nobis iam donatum sit, euidenter ostenditur. In illis Sacrificijs prænunciabatur Filius Dei pro impijs occidendus: in hoc autem, pro impijs annuntiatur occisus. In those Fleashly Sacrifices (of the Iewes) there was a Figure of the Fleashe of Christ, whiche he woulde afterwarde offer for vs, and of the Bloude, whiche he would afterwarde shed for the Remission of Sinne. But in this Sacrifice (of the newe Testament) there is a Thankesgeuinge, and a Remembrance of the Fleashe, which he hath already offered for vs, and of the Bloud, which he being God, hath already shed for vs. In those Sacrifices it was represented vnto vs vnder a Figure, what thing should be geuen vnto vs: But in this Sacrifice it is plainly set forth, what thing is already geuen vs. In those Sacrifices it was declared, that the Sonne of God should be slaine for the wicked: But in this Sacrifice it is plainly preached vnto vs, that the same Sonne of God hath already benne slaine for the wicked.

Aug. De Fide ad Petrum Diakon. cap. 19.

G

Like

Diuif. 1.

*A Reioindre to M. Iewels Replie*

*Aug. Contra  
Fau-  
sum. lib.  
20. ca. 21.*

*Like wise againe he saith; Huius Sacrificij Caro, & Sanguis ante Aduentum Christi per Victimam Similitudinum promittebatur: in Passione per ipsam Veritatem reddebatur: Post Ascensum vero Christi per Sacramentum Memoriae celebratur.* The fleshe, and Bloude of this Sacrifice, before the coming of Christ, was promised by Sacrifices of Resemblance: The same in his Passion (vpon the Crosse) was geuen in Truth, and in deede: But after his Ascension it is solemnized by a Sacramente of Remembrance.

*This is the Difference that S. Augustine noteth betwene the Sacramentes of the Olde Lawe, and the Sacramentes of the Newe. Therefore, the vwoordes, that M. Harding hath here vnto added, Christe is offered vp vnto his Father, and that vnder the Formes of Bread, and VVine, yea and that truly, and in deede, are his owne onely vwoordes, confidently, and boldly presumed of him selfe, neuer vsed, neither by S. Augustine, nor by any other Ancient godly Father.*

*Harding.*

Ful euil doth it become you to charge me with wrong done vnto S. Augustine, whereas in the very next sentence before, your self did him so much wrong, as to farther a saying vpon him in that place, where he hath none such at al. If he be to be burthened with doing wrong vnto the Doctours; that in alleging their sayings doth not with al circumstances of the place that serueth to the present purpose set them forth: then is there no man so much to be reprov'd, as your selfe M. Iewel. For of al that euer wrote, we finde none, that so much, and with like falshode, and to so euil meaning, cutteth, pareth, and nippeth their sentences, as you commonly doo. Truly in laying this to my charge, you haue not so clearly proued me to haue donne wrong vnto S. Augustine: as you haue with the scornful vtterance of your wordes declared your owne spite.

Con-

M. Jewels  
charge  
discharg  
ged.

Concerning the thing it selfe, I haue donne S. Augustine no wrong at al. For what needed me to reherse his whole processe to the ende of the Chapter? I recited faithfully so much as appertained to the proufe of the mater for which I alleged his authoritie. The sentence that foloweth belongeth to an other mater, whereby is declared (which no catholike man euer denied) that the Sacrifice of the newe Testament is a thanks geuing, and a commemoration of Christes flesh and bloude, which he hath offered for vs. But that member of the diuision, which I went about to establish by S. Augustines authoritie, speaketh onely of the Sacrifices of the olde Lawe, that they prefigured the flesh of Christ, which he would afterward offer, and the bloude, that he would shed for remission of sinnes. If I had reherfed al that you blame me for leauing it out, I had but made the booke bigger, and wearied the reader with a long superfluous saying, superfluous I say, bicause the same was in effect vttered in the next sentence before, taken out also of the same S. Augustine. For al that you force out of the longe processe there folowing, is only the comemoration of Christes flesh and blood offered and shed, which (though in fewer wordes) was expressed in the former sentence out of the bookes against Faustus the Manichey, as the reader by conference may sone perceiue.

The place of S. Augustine, for leauing out whereof you so much reprove me, and wherein you repose the confidence of your doctrim, helpeth you nothing at al. For there he saith, not what is the substance of our Sacrifice, wherein lyeth the questiō: but what thing is done in our Sacrifice, to wit, geuing of thanks, and the comemoratiō

**Diuis.**

**A Reigindre to M. Iewels Replie**

of our Lordes flesh and bloude, which he offred and shed for vs, and likewise what thing is shewed and declared in the same, that is to say, his death and passion. Al which we denye not. But that S. Augustine ascribing vnto the Sacrifice of the Church thanks geuing, and commemoration of the flesh and bloude of Christ, doth exclude the real Sacrifice of his fleshe and bloude, by vertue of his woorde through the holy Ghost made substantially present: that we denie vtterly. And that was your parte to proue, els you proue nothing againste the auncient doctrine of the Church.

M. Iewels  
erret h  
one truth  
against an  
other  
truth

But seing your selfe not hable to performe so muche, you thought it an easier mater, after your common woonte, to set one truth against an other truth, to wit, the commemoration or memorie of the bloody Sacrifice of the Crosse, against the vnbloudy and mystical Sacrifice of the Aulter. By the worde mystical, I exclude not the truth of our Lordes body and bloude, the substance of this Sacrifice: but I signifie the couert manner of their being in the same. If S. Augustine had in that place affirmed in the Sacrifice of the Church a thanks geuing and remembrance of Christes death only, wherein he should haue said vnruly: in some respect then had he serued your turne. Now that he saith not so, by the vncourteous reprove of me for leauing the wordes vnreherfed, which pertained not to my purpose, and helpe your doctrine nothing at al: it appeareth how feeble the parte is, that with the trompet of your vaine Challenge you woulde needes to be proclaimed, and that now with your colourable Replie you haue taken in hande to mainteyne.

S. Au.

S. Augustine contrarywise declaring with what kinde of Sacrifices the Iewes gaue a signification of Christes Sacrifice that was to come, and with what kinde of Sacrifice the Christians do kepe the remembrance of Christes Sacrifice now past:saith expressely,that the substāce of the Iewes sacrifices were brute beasts, and that of the Christians Sacrifice is the body and bloude of Christ. his woordes be these. *Hebraei in victimis pecorum prophetiam celebrabant futura victima, quam Christus obtulit. Vnde iam Christiani per acti eiusdem sacrificij memoriam celebrant oblatione & participatione corporis & Sanguinis Christi.* The Hebrewes celebrated a prophecie of the Sacrifice to come, which Christe offered. Wherevpon the Christians doe now celebrate the memorie of the same Sacrifice already performed, by the offering, and receiuing of the body and bloud of Christe. Augu. cōr. Faust. lib. 20, ca. 18.

This Sacrifice was in al times to be recommended vnto the mynde of man, bicause thereof onely dependeth the saluation of man. Before the Lawe, and during the tyme of the Lawe, it was prefigured and fore-signified by many and sundry thinges, but specially by the sacrifices of beastes. In the time of grace, whertin we now liue, the Christians do preferue, kepe, celebrate, and solemnize the memorie of it by a more liuely and effectual representatiō, as to whom more abundāce of grace through Christes Incarnation is dispensed, that is, as Saint Augustine teacheth, *by the Oblation and participation of the same body and bloude*, that was offered and shed for vs. Nowe if it be not the true body and bloude of Christe, that we offer and receiue: then neither can S. Augustines wordes be duly iustified, and the Sacrifice of the Chri-



Diuis.

A Reioindre to M. Iewels Replie

stians shal be lesse liuely, lesse euident, lesse representatiue (as I may so say) and of lesse valewe, then were the Sacrifices of the Iewes. For what comparison is there betwene a Lambe, and a piece of bread with a suppe of wine? And who iudgeth not the death of Christe to be more expressely represented by a lambe slaine, then by bare bread and wine?

Neither bicause our Sacrifice is done in commemoration or remembrance, thereof foloweth it, that the presence of Christes body and blood is not requisite. But forasmuch as this is the commemoration, *which alone*

Origen, in *maketh God merciful vnto vs*, as Origen saith: therefore to  
Leuit. the working of so great an effecte it is necessary, that  
Hom. 13. Christes true body and bloude be really present in our Sacrifice.

M. Iewels  
excludeth one  
truth by  
an other.

And whereas you bring Testimonies of the Fathers to proue that our Sacrifice is a remembrance, an exaple, a token, or signe of the true Sacrifice that was made vpon the Crosse, you tooke more paines then neede required. For that no Catholike man denieth. But the conclusion, which guilefully your endeour is to inferre thereof, which is, that therefore Christe is not really present, and offered by the Priest: we deny vtterly. For both be true, that Christe is present substantially and in deede, and is so offred by the Priest, and also that the same is donne in a remembrance. And this much is witnessed by S. Chrysostome, where he saith, *Pontifex noster ille est, qui hostiam mundantem nos obtulit. Ipsam offerimus Et nunc, qua tunc oblata quidem consumi non potest. Hoc autem quod facimus, in commemoratione quidem fit eius, quod factum est.* Christ is our Bishop, who offered a Sacrifice cleansing

Chrysost.  
in epist. ad  
Heb. Ho-  
mil. 17.

cleasing vs. We do offer the selfe same now also. Which being then offered can not be consumed. That which we doo, is done in commemoration of that which was done.

Here we be taught by S. Chrysostom, that we offer now the selfe same hoste or Sacrifice, that Christe our high Bishhop offered, wherewith to cleanse vs from the filth of our sinnes: which was none other, but his owne body and bloude. And neuerthelesse that which we doo, is done for a remembraunce of that, which Christe did. So that by Chrysostoms iudgement, neither the commemoration, nor example, nor signe doth exclude the real presence, and real oblation of Christes body and bloude. But you M. Iewel after your common manner go about to put away one truth by another truth. Which your accustomed shifte is now very stale, and moueth fewe, that reade your bookes with any meane iudgement. For the foolishnes of your argument is laughed at by euery Baker, who hauing set forth a loafe of breade vpon his stal, can tel you, that that loafe signifieth and putteth folke in mynde, there is bread to be solde in his house, and that the same notwithstanding is breade, as other his loaves be, and perhaps of the same bathe. Right so the body of Christe in the Sacrament, is both a signe of Christes body, and also his very true body in dede. And likewise his very flesh and bloude is offered in our dredful mysteries, in signe, commemoration, and remembrance of his flethe and bloude, offered and shed vpon the Crosse.

Comme-  
moratio.  
example.  
ad signe,  
do not  
exclude  
the real  
presence,  
and real  
oblation.

You

**Y**OU finde great fault with that I said, Christe is offered vp vnto his Father vnder the formes of breade and wine, truly, and in dede: and to make it seme more odious, you affirme *these to be myne own only words, confidently, and boldly presumed of my selfe, neuer used before by any auncient Father.* Whiles you take delite in such Rhetorical amplifications, you do but increase the number of your vntruthes, and make the worlde witnesse of your shamelesse vanitie. Though the auncient Fathers that wrote within in the first six hundred yeres after Christe, haue not these precise termes, yet they haue the self same doctrin: and that is ynough. Your Sacrametarie heresie is not so auncient, the Church was, as it were in quiet possession of the Catholike faith touching this Article, for the space of a thousand yeres. If the flames of your heresie had flashed abroad out of Hel in their daies, there is no doubt, they would haue quenched it with streames of holesom doctrine vttered in the same termes, whereof now you would faine take some aduantage.

*These termes, Christ is offered vp to his Father vnder the formes of bread and wine truly and in dede, proued not to be of my private deuise.*

**H**OW so euer it be concerning the auncient Fathers, certaine it is these termes be not of my onely presumption, or deuising. It is wel knowen to al that reade the later Councils both general, and prouincial, the Scholastical Doctours, and who so euer haue writ-

ten against Berengarius, Wickleff, Luther, Zuinglius, Oecolampadius, Caluine, and those other late false teachers: that these be not wordes of mine owne inuention, but common to others that haue written in this matter sithens your Heresie first sprang. Christe is in the Sacrifice of the Church so offered, as he is present: for there he is made present by vertue of consecration to be offered, and to be receiued. But he is present vnder the formes of Breade and Wine, and that truely, and in deede. Ergo he is offered vnder the formes of Breade and Wine, truly, and in deede. For proufe of the Minor, or second Proposition, for els nothing here I suppose you wil denie: that it may appeare these wordes not to be of myne owne onely deuising, let a fewe testimonies suffice, where many might easily be brought.

In the great Council of Laterane thus you finde *In Actis*  
this Article set forth. *Verum Christi corpus, & sanguis Conc. Late*  
*in Sacramento Altaris sub speciebus panis & vini veraciter can. cap. 1.*  
*continentur, transubstantiatis pane in corpus, & vino in de fid. Car.*  
*sanguinem potestate Diuina.* The true Body of Christe, and his Bloude are contained truely and in deede (for so much the worde *veraciter* doth signifie) in the Sacrament of the Aulter, vnder the formes of breade and wine, the breade being transubstantiate into the body, and the wine into the bloude, by the power of God.

The Council of Florence, whereat accorde was made betwene the Greke and Latine Church, hath the very like, or rather the same wordes touching the point by you denied. *Sacerdos in persona Christi loquens, hoc conficit Sacramentum. Nam ipsorum verborum virtute substantia panis in corpus Christi, & substantia vini in sanguinem*

*In Decret.*  
*Con. Flor.*  
*super vnio.*  
*Iacobin. &*  
*Armenior,*

H

conuer-

*conuertuntur, ita tamen quod totus Christus continetur sub specie panis, & totus sub specie vini, sub qualibet quoque parte hostie consecratae, & vini consecrati, separatione facta totus est Christus.* The Priest speaking in the person of Christe, consecrateth this Sacrament. For by the vertue of the very wordes the substance of bread is turned into the body of Christe, and the substance of wine into his bloude, yet so that Christ is contened whole vnder the forme of bread, and whole vnder the forme of wine. Also if a diuision be made, Christe is whole vnder euery parte of the consecrate hoste, and of the consecrate wine.

Concil. Tri-  
dent. Sess.  
22. Cap. 1.

With this agreeth the late learned Council of Trent, whose wordes these be touching both the real presence, and also the real Sacrifice. *Christus in cœna nouissima sacerdotem secundum ordinem Melchisedech se in æternum constitutum declarans, corpus & sanguinem suum sub speciebus panis & vini Deo Patri obtulit, ac sub earundem rerum symbolis, Apostolis, quos tunc noui testamenti Sacerdotes constituebat, ut sumerent, tradidit, & eisdem, eorūq; in sacerdotio successoribus, ut offerrent, præcepit per hæc verba: Hoc facite in meam cômémorationem.* Christe in his last supper declaring him selfe to be ordeined a Priest for euer after the order of Melchisedech, offered vp vnto God the Father his body and bloud vnder the formes of bread and wine, and deliuered them vnder the signes of the same thinges vnto the Apostles, whom then he ordeined Priestes of the newe Testament, that they should receine: and gaue commaundement to them, and to their successours in Priesthode, that they should offer the same, by these wordes, Doo ye this in my remembrance.

Petrus



Petrus Lombardus saith, *Sub specie panis & vini, Sententia corpus & sanguinem suum discipulis tradidit.* Christe gaue <sup>lib 4.</sup> his body and his bloude vnto his Disciples vnder the <sup>stinct. 8.</sup> forme of breade and wine.

S. Thomas also, whom onely I allege among so many Scholastical Doctours, saith most plainely. *Quia non est consuetum hominibus, sed horribile, carnem hominis comedere, & sanguinem bibere: proponuntur nobis castione. 74* <sup>In tertia parte Summe. quæstione. 74</sup> ro & sanguis Christi sumenda sub speciebus illorum, quæ frequentius in usum hominis veniunt, scilicet panis & vini.

Bicause it is not a thing customable for men, but a horrible thing, to eate mans flesh, and drinke mans bloude: the flesh and bloude of Christe are set before vs to be receiued vnder the formes of those thinges, which man is commonly vsed vnto, to wit, of bread and wine.

There was no neede why I should recite so many testimonies for a thing so cleare, and so wel known, I graunt. Yet bicause you are either so ignorant, which I beleue not, or so thamelesse, which semeth, as to say, these woordes, *Christe is offred vp vnto his Father vnder the formes of bread and wine, truly, and in deede*, to be my woordes onely, confidently, and boldly presumed of my selfe, as though I were the first that deuised them of mine owne head, and the first that presumed to vse them: I thought good to reherse so much, to thintent I might cleare my selfe of such presumption, and geue the worlde to vnderstand, how litle you regard to vse manifest and impudent lying for maintenance of your doctrine, rather then you would seme to be ouercome. It is a token ye care litle what ye say, when ye feare not to vtter so open vntruth.

An impudent lye that can not be excused.

If for this point you require testimonies of auncient Fathers, whom you pretende to alowe: as the same doctrine is by them most assuredly auouched, whiche is ynough, as I said before: so some of them haue vttered it either with the same wordes, or with the very like, and such, as in signification are equiualent. S. Hilary

*Hilar. de Trinit. lib. 8.* faith, *Nos verè sub mysterio carnem corporis sui sumimus.* We receiue the flesh of his body vnder a mysterie truly, or verily.

*Augu. ad Bonifaciu Epist. 23.* S. Augustine faith, *Nonne semel oblatuſ est Christus in ſemetipſo? Et tamen in Sacramēto non ſolū per omnes Paſche ſolennitates, ſed omni die populis immolatur.* Was not Chriſte once offered vp in him ſelfe? And yet neuertheſſe he is ſacrificed in a Sacrament for the people, not only through al the ſolemne feaſtes of Eaſter, but alſo euery day. Here you muſt either graunt, that the fleſhe of Chriſtes body to be receiued of vs in, or vnder a myſterie, and Chriſte him ſelfe to be ſacrificed in a ſacrament, doth importe his fleſhe to be eaten, and him to be ſacrificed vnder the formes of bread and wine, which be our Sacrament, and the eating of Chriſtes body vnder the which, is an eating myſtical, or eating vnder a myſterie: or els you muſt ſhewe vs ſome other mater, wherein as vnder a myſterie, and as in a Sacramente, his body is eaten, and him ſelfe is offered.

*De conſec. Diſtinct. 2.* But there is an other more manifeſt place in S. Auguſtine, where he uſeth the very ſame termes and wordes, that you would nedes to be myne only, and of my ſelfe boldely and confidently preſumed. His woordes be theſe. *Caro eius eſt, quam forma panis opertam in Sacramen-*

*cramento accipimus, & sanguis eius, quem sub vini specie & sapore potamus.* It is the flesh of Christe, which we receiue couered with the forme of bread in the Sacramēt, and his bloude, which we drinke vnder the shewe and taste of wine.

You see then M. Iewel, these wordes be not onely myne, they be S. Augustines, whose auctoritie you can not contemne. Neither can you reasonably reiecte the booke out of which they be taken, bicause your selfe euen in this very place haue alleged it for your helpe. If, as he saith, we eate the flesh of Christe couered with the forme of bread, then so is he also offred. For before it be receiued of vs, it behoueth it be cōsecrate and offred. Therefore it is true which I said, Christ is offered in forme of bread: onlesse you make a differēce between Christes flesh and bloud in formes of bread and wine, and Christes flesh and bloude couered with the formes of bread and wine.

This is so plaine, that you must needes yeelde vnto it. As for the answer you make to this place alleged by me in the .12. Article, it is such, as any man that knoweth your Diuinitie, would sone iudge it to be a peece of your owne coyning. The whole is fooiled and glased ouer with a false colour of a phrase of speache. As though wordes in al phrases were taken in one and the selfe same signification. Your aunswer is this. Bicause this worde *Forma*, forme or shape in English, doth signifie the substance in S. Paule, where he saith, *Christus seipsum exinaniuit formam serui accipiens*, Christe emptied him selfe taking the forme of a seruaunt: therefore it must signifie the substance in this place of S. Au-

In the Re-  
plic, Page.  
471. lin. 6.

Phil. 2.

Diuisi.

*A Reioindre to M. Jewels Replie*

gustine, *Caro Christi est, quam forma panis operam accipimus*, It is Christes flesh, that we receiue couered with the forme of bread.

M. Jewels  
ignorance  
or malice.

μορφή,  
форма.

In this answer you considered not, first that a thing can not in proper speache be said to be couered with the substance of an other thing, bicause the substance of thinges is inuisible. Next, that in some places this worde *Forma*, or μορφή, which S. Paule in that place vseth, is an Accident, and a mere qualitie, as in Aristotle, in *quarta specie Qualitatis*, and is not alwaies taken for the name of nature, as it is taken of Aristotle, in 2. *Physicorum*. Againe you looked not vnto the later parte of S. Augustines sentence, where it is likewise of the bloud said, *Sanguis est, quem sub vini specie & sapore potamus*. It is bloude, that vnder the shew and fauour of wine we drinke. By these wordes, *shew* and *saour*, the accidentes of wine, and not the substance must needes be vnderstanded. By conference of which two membres of one sentence together, you should haue perceiued, that S. Augustine speaking of Christes flesh, meant by the worde, *Forma*, the same that he meant by the other wordes, *species*, and *sapor*, where he spake of the bloude. If then we drinke the bloude of Christe vnder the accidentes of wine, then it is a true construction to say, that we receiue his flesh couered with the forme, that is to say, with the shew and outward shape (which is an Accident) of bread.

*operta.*

As for the worde, *operta*, which signifieth *couered*, in the same place you make much a doo, and rake together out of your Notebookes a heape of phrases and wordes, by which, lying priny, hyding, couering, keeping

keeping priuy, representation, resemblance, and any the like thing is signified: And al to an heretical purpose, to exclude the true presence of Chistes body and bloude out of the blessed Sacrament, and to leaue nothing in it but a bare signification. And there in the ende you shutte vp the mater with a false caste of legerdemaine, falsifying a testimonie of S. Augustine.

For whereas S. Augustine saith, *In veteri Testamento occultabatur nouum, quia occultè significabatur*: The newe Testament was hidden in the olde Testament, bicause it was secretly signified: you haue chaunged S. Augustines worde, *quia*, into *id est*, and say, *that he expoundeth him selfe, occultabatur, id est, occultè significabatur*, It was hidden, that is to say, it was secretly signified. And therefore you would haue the place which I alleged out of S. Augustine, thus to be expounded and vnderstanded, *Caro Christi operata, id est, occultè significata*: Christes flesh is priuily hidden, that is to say, is priuily signified, whereby you would exclude the real presence.

August. de  
Baptis. cōt.  
Dona tist.  
lib. 1. ca. 15

M. Jewell  
falsifieth  
S. Augustine,  
changing  
*quia*, into  
*id est*.

And this you call S. Augustines exposition, as though S. Augustine had euer said so, or meant so, and as though *operata* had in the place I alleged, bene put alone without an Ablatiue case, as the verbe, *occultabatur*, is in the other sentence. Nowe the true wordes of S. Augustine be these. *Caro eius est, quam forma panis operatam in Sacramento accipimus*. It is his flesh, which being coouered with the forme of bread in the Sacrament, we receiue.

And if you would needes haue these wordes, *Forma panis operatam*, to be expounded by *Forma panis occultè significatā*



gustine, *Caro Christi est, quam forma panis operam accipimus*, It is Christes flesh, that we receiue coouered with the forme of bread.

M. Jewels  
ignorance  
or malice.

μορφή,  
forma.

In this answer you considered not, first that a thing can not in proper speache be said to be coouered with the substance of an other thing, bicause the substance of thinges is inuisible. Next, that in some places this worde *Forma*, or μορφή, which S. Paule in that place vseth, is an Accident, and a mere qualitie, as in Aristotle, in quarta specie *Qualitatus*, and is not alwaies taken for the name of nature, as it is taken of Aristotle, in 2. *Physicorum*. Againe you looked not vnto the later parte of S. Augustines sentence, where it is likewise of the bloud said, *Sanguis est, quem sub vini specie & sapore potamus*. It is bloude, that vnder the shew and fauour of wine we drinke. By these wordes, *shew* and *saour*, the accidentes of wine, and not the substance must needes be vnderstanded. By conference of which two membres of one sentence together, you should haue perceiued, that S. Augustine speaking of Christes flesh, meant by the worde, *Forma*, the same that he meant by the other wordes, *species*, and *sapor*, where he spake of the bloude. If then we drinke the bloude of Christe vnder the accidententes of wine, then it is a true construction to say, that we receiue his flesh coouered with the forme, that is to say, with the shew and outward shape (which is an Accident) of bread.

operta.

As for the worde, *operta*, which signifieth *coouered*, in the same place you make much a doo, and rake together out of your Notebookes a heape of phrases and wordes, by which, lying priuy, hyding, coouering, keeping

keeping priuy, representation, resemblance, and any the like thing is signified: And al to an heretical purpose, to exclude the true presence of Chistes body and bloude out of the blessed Sacrament, and to leaue nothing in it but a bare signification. And there in the ende you shutte vp the mater with a false caste of legierdemaine, falsifying a testimonie of S. Augustine.

For whereas S. Augustine saith, *In veteri Testamento occultabatur nouum, quia occultè significabatur*: The newe Testament was hidden in the olde Testament, bicause it was secretly signified: you haue chaunged S. Augustines worde, *quia*, into *id est*, and say, *that he expoundeth him selfe, occultabatur, id est, occultè significabatur, It was hidden, that is to say, it was secretly signified.* And therefore you would haue the place which I alleged out of S. Augustine, thus to be expounded and vnderstanded, *Caro Christi operta, id est, occultè significata: Christes flesh is priuily hidden, that is to say, is priuily signified*, whereby you would exclude the real presence.

August. de  
Baptis. cōt.  
Dona rist.  
lib. 1. c. 17

M. Iewell  
falsifieth  
S. Augustine,  
changing  
*quia*, into  
*id est*.

And this you call S. Augustines exposition, as though S. Augustine had euer said so, or meant so, and as though *operta* had in the place I alleged, bene put alone without an Ablatiue case, as the verbe, *occultabatur*, is in the other sentence. Nowe the true wordes of S. Augustine be these. *Caro eius est, quam forma panis opertam in Sacramento accipimus.* It is his flesh, which being coouered with the forme of bread in the Sacrament, we receiue.

And if you would needes haue these wordes, *Forma panis opertam*, to be expounded by *Forma panis occultè significatā*

Unuist.

*A Reioindre to M. Jewels Replie.*

One  
truth put  
avvay by  
an other.

*significatam* (though you haue no warrant for it) that we vnderstand the flesh of Christe couered with the forme of breade, to be as much as if we said it to be secretly signified by the forme of bread, wherein there is no great cause why we should much contend with you: what can you thereof substantially conclude against the real presence? Wil you make this wise argument, The forme or shape of breade signifieth the body of Christ, *Ergo*, the body of Christ is not in deede present? If you reason so, the Baker must haue you to schole, who shewing you a loafe set vpon his stal, can tel you, that that loafe signifieth breade to be in his howse to be solde, and yet that the same loafe also is breade, whiche I tolde you before. And yet this is al the issue of your wrested interpretations, and heaped phrascs. Once leaue your bad shifte of putting away one truth by an other truth. Howe oftentimes muste we tel you, the formes of bread and wine do signifie the body and bloud of Christ present, not absent?

Cyrl. Hierosol. Catechisi.  
Mystagog.

Againe if for proufe that these wordes, which reporte Christe to be present in the blessed Sacrament of the Aulter, or to be offered in the Sacrifice of the Aulter vnder the formes of bread and wine, be not onely my wordes, I should here also allege the place of *Cyrrillus Hierosolymitanus*, which I alleged in my Answer to the tenth Article of your Challenge: what could you reasonably replye to the contrary? That auncient Father saith thus, vsing the verie termes of the Scholastical Doctours. *Christe once chaunged water into wine, which is nye vnto blonde, in Chana of Galiley by his onely wil: and shal not he be worthy to be beleued of vs, that at his*

his last supper) he chaunged wine into bloude? For if being bidden to a corporal wedding he wrought a woonderous miracle, shal we not much more confesse, that he gaue his body and bloude vnto the children of the Spouse? Wherefore with al assurednesse let vs receiue the body and bloud of Christe.

(Hitherto reason mouing credit, now folow the wordes that are specially to be noted.) *Nam sub specie panis datur tibi corpus, & sub specie vini datur sanguis, ut sumptu corpore & sanguine Christi, efficiaris ei comparticeps corporis & sanguinis.* For vnder the forme (shape, shew or figure) of bread the body (of Christe) is geuen vnto thee, and vnder the shape of wine his bloud is geuen, that hauing receiued the body and bloud of Christe, thou maist be made co-partener with him of his body and bloude. Here haue you the expresse wordes, teaching vs the body of Christe to be present in the Sacramēt vnder the forme of bread, and his bloude vnder the forme of wine, which you report to be wordes of myne owne only inuention, neuer vsed by any auncient Father before my tyme.

ἐν τύπῳ  
αὐτοῦ  
ἐν τύπῳ  
οἴνου

Where you go about to answer to this place of S. Cyrillus in the tenth Article of your Replie, to thintent the body and bloud of Christ might not be beleued to be really present in the blessed Sacramēt: I wish that al men saw both your weakenes, and also your falshod. You confesse this lerned Fathers wordes touching this point of the real presence, to be *quicke and violent*. Whereby vnwares as it semeth, you confesse him therein to be cleare, and resolute, as he is in dede. To say truly, violent he is not, but a plaine reporter of the truth. But in dede he is to quicke, for dul heretikes, that beleue their carnal senses, rather then Christes owne most plaine wordes.

Vwordes  
in M.  
Iewels  
iudgemēt  
quicke  
and viol  
lent.

# Diuisi.

## A Reioindre to M. Iewels Replie

In the  
tenth Ar-  
ticle of  
the Res-  
plie, page  
432.

Yet he him self in plainest wise (say you) openeth, and clea-  
reth his owne meaning. Truth it is, he doth so, as euery one  
that readeth the place, as the Author reporteth it, nor as  
you haue falsified him, may easily iudge. Now bicause e-  
uery man hath not the booke of Cyrillus, nor the booke  
of your Replie at hande, for truthe sake, and that your  
impudent fallshod may appeare: it shal be to good purpose,  
to lay here before the Reader, what you make that holy  
and auncient Father to say, and what he saith him selfe.  
Thus then say you falsly.

M. Iewell  
falsifieth  
S. Cyril-  
lus Hiero-  
folym.  
Cateches.  
Mystago-  
gia. 4.

For thus he writeth. *Ne consideres, tanquam panem nudū:  
Panis Eucharistiae non est amplius panis simplex, & nudus.*  
Consider not, as if it were bare bread: The bread of the Sa-  
crament is no longer bare and simple bread. Which wordes  
are naturally resolved thus. It is bread, how be it not only bare  
bread: but bread, and some other thing elles beside. And there-  
after a few wordes you conclude thus. Of these wordes of  
Cyrillus we may wel reason thus by the way. The Sacrament  
is not only, or bare bread: therefore it is bread, albeit not only  
bare bread. And thus the same Cyrillus, that is brought to  
testifie, that there remaineth no bread in the Sacrament, te-  
stifieth most plainly to the contrary, that there is bread re-  
maining in the Sacrament.

Catecho.  
Myst. 4.

On the other side, S. Cyrillus truly alleged saith thus.  
*Ne consideres tanquam panem nudum, & vinum nudum:  
corpus enim est, & sanguis Christi, secundum ipsius Do-  
mini verba. Quamuis enim sensus hoc tibi suggererit, tamen  
fides te confirmet, ne ex gustu rem indices, quin potius ha-  
beas ex fide pro certissimo, ita ut nulla subeat dubitatio, esse ti-  
bi donata corpus & sanguinem.* Doo not consider it as bare  
breade, and bare wine: for it is the body and bloude of  
Christe.



Christe, according vnto the wordes of our Lorde him selfe. For although thy sense make that suggestion vnto thee, yet let faith strengthen thee, that thou iudge not the thing by thy taste, but rather that of thy faith thou hold it as a most certaintie, so as thou be void of al doubt, that the body and bloud are geuen to thee.

These wordes being truly alleged, doo clearely open the meaning of *Cyrrillus*. Your false forgeries and corruptions doo vndoubtedly declare, that you seeke not the truth, but intende deceit. False doctrine must be maintained, by false meanes. If you had meant good faith and truth, you would truly and faithfully haue recited that holy Fathers wordes without such mangling and chaunging. Now to vse your owne Rhetorike, you haue done him great and open wrong, wilfully suppressing and drowning his wordes, and vncourteously commaunding him to silence in the midst of his tale. Why did you not consider the force of his counsel, which is, that a Christen man regarde not the suggestion of his senses, but stay him selfe vpon his faith, not iudging of this high Mysterie, what the sense of sight or tast geueth, but with a simple faith beleuing the wordes that Christ spake.

In al S. *Cyrrillus* you find not this order of wordes, *Pan-  
nis Eucharistia non est amplius panis simplex & nudus*, The bread of the Sacrament is no lenger bare and simple breade, as you turne it, and ascribe it vnto S. *Cyrrillus*. By occasion of which wordes you tel vs of your natural resolution, and beare vs in hande, *it is bread, how be it not only or bare bread*. Which is no natural resolution gathered of S. *Cyrrillus* wordes, but a crafty collusion wroong

out of your owne forged woordes to enuegle the ignorant.

In cate-  
ches. 3. My  
figogica.

Now S. Cyrillus wordes be these, not in the fourth *Catechesis*, as you haue quoted your booke, but in the third, where he speaketh of the holy Oile. *Quemadmodū* (saith he) *Panis Eucharistia, post sancti spiritus inuocationem, non amplius est panis communis, sed est corpus Christi: sic & sanctum hoc unguentum, non amplius est unguentum nudum, neque (si ita quis appellare malit) commune, postquam iam consecratum est. &c.* As the bread of the Sacrament, after the Holy Ghoste is called vpon it, is no lenger common bread, but is the body of Christ: so this holy ointment also is no lenger a bare ointment, nor (if any man had rather so to call it) a common ointment, after that it is now consecrated. The wordes which you abuse to gyle, *simple bread, bare bread, only bread*, be not there vsed of S. Cyrill<sup>o</sup>, as you of purpose haue falsified him. Mary, speaking of the holy Oile, whose substance is not changed into another substance, and remaineth Oile still after it is consecrated, he saith, it is no lenger after consecration bare Oile. But of the breade he saith that after consecration it is not common breade: As if it were done of a great foresight, and of very purpose, to stoppe the wrangling of such false Sacramentaries, and corrupte teachers, in consideration that after consecration it is no lenger breade, that is to say, common breade, but the body of Christe the breade of life, that came downe from heauen. The like is to be iudged of the cup.

Ioan. 6.  
M. Iewels  
saithode  
plainely  
detected.  
Math. 26.  
Luc. 22.

What wilt thou haue more good Reader? Christe saith of the one, it is his body, of the other, it is his blood: Saint Cyrillus here saith, it is not breade, it is not wine, but

but the body and bloud of our Lorde. And to declare his meaning plainly against al caullation of heretikes, he biddeth vs not to cal our senses, as sight, taste, or any other sense, to geue vs accompt, what it is: but to stay our hartes vpon faith, and to beleue the wordes of our Sauour. M. Iewel contrariwise forging a saying of his owne, and falsly fathering it vpon S. Cyrillus, as though he had said, it is not bare, simple, or only breade, which that auncient Father saith not: concludeth his Sacramentary doctrine, that it is bread. If thou hadst rather go out of the way, and be deceiued, then go right: thou hast whome to followe. But howe false a guide he is, these thinges considered, thou canst not be ignorant.

If after this large proufe of the being of Christes body and bloude in the Sacrament vnder the formes of bread and wine, whiche forme of wordes you would your Reader thinke to be myne only, and neuer to haue ben vsed before by any of the auncient Fathers, if I say after al this, least you should seme fully confuted, you wil yet reply, and say, that I haue nothing wherby to auouche the true and real Sacrifice of Christe (for so much also do your wordes importe): then omitting here an infinite number of other testimonies, for proufe that Christ is truly, and in deede offered vp of the Priestes in Sacrifice, I wil in this place allege onely the testimonie of the first Nicene Councel. The auctoritie wherof is, and hath euer ben esteemed very great, as that, which declareth not the opinion of one man, but the faith of the whole Church of that time, vttered by the mouthes, and after mature and long deliberation confirmed with the subscription of. 318. the best learned, and most holy

That  
Christe is  
truly and  
in deede  
offered,

Bishops then lyuing.

*Conc. Nic.* The holy Ghoſte by them published to the whole Church of God this doctrine. *Exaltata mente ſide conſideremus ſitum eſſe in illa ſancta menſa Agnum Dei, qui tollit peccata mundi, qui a ſacerdotibus ſacrificatur ſine cruoris effuſione.* Liſting vp our mynde let vs conſider by faith the Lambe of God, that taketh away the finnes of the worlde, to be layed vpon that holy table, which is of the Prieſtes ſacrificed without the ſheddinge of bloude, that is to ſay, not after the manner of other ſacrifices, where the hoſte is ſlain, for ſo ſignifieth the worde,

Real, and  
true Sa-  
crifice,  
and Sacri-  
fice in  
deede.

What other thing doth this addition, *without the ſhedding of bloude*, importe, but a true and real ſacrificing of one and the ſame ſubſtance, that was before ſacrificed with bloud ſhedding? For theſe two contrary Accidētes be referred vnto one ſubſtance, and haue their being in one ſubſtance. Seinge then it was the ſubſtance of Chriſtes moſt pretious body and bloude, that was offred bloudily, truly, and in deede vpon the Croſſe: it wil follow by neceſſary ſequels of reaſon, that it is the ſame ſelf ſubſtance of Chriſt, that is ſacrificed vnbloudily, onleſſe perhaps you wil imagine there be two Chriſtes offered, the one bloudily, the other vnbloudily. If then it be the ſubſtance of Chriſt, that is offred, it is a true and real Sacrifice. For where ſo euer Chriſtes ſubſtance is offred, there is a true Sacrifice, and a Sacrifice in deede. And thus is your vn courteous reproch of my vndue boldnes, and preſumption in vttering the true doctrine of the Church with the foreſaied woordes, answered, and clerely diſcharged. Now let vs ſee, what other greater fault

fault or ouersight you finde in my Answer . Thus it foloweth in your Replie.

Jewel.

But vyhere as he addeth further, That Christ is in deede, and verily offered by the Priest; al be it, as he saith, not in respect of the manner of offeringe, but onely in respect of the presence of his Bodie; Either he vnderstandeth not, vyhat him selfe meaneth; or els vvith a vaine distinction of cloudie vwoordes vvithout sense, he laboureth to dashe his Readers eies. For vvhat a fantasie is this, to saie, Christ is offered Verily, and in deede, and yet not in Respect of the Manner of offeringe? VVhat Respecte? VVhat Manner is this? VVherefore comme these blinde Mysteries abroad without a glose? VVhiche of al the Olde Doctors, or holy Fathers euer taught vs thus to speake? Certainly, as he saith, Christ is Really offered, and yet not in Respect of the Manner of Offering: So maie he also saie, Christ died vpon the Crosse, and yet not in Respect of the manner of dieinge. By suche manners, and suche Respectes he maie make of Christian Religion, vvhat him listeth.

Yf he thinke, somevvhat to shadowe the water vvith these vwoordes of the Councel of Nice, Sine Sacrificio Oblatus, Let him consider afore hande, it vvill not he alpe him. For the holie Fathers in that Councel neither saie, that Christ is Reallie Offered by the Priest, nor seeme to vnderstande these strange Respectes, and Manvers of Offeringe. They agree fullie in sense vvith that is before alleged of S. Augustine: In this Sacrifice the Death of Christe is solemnized by a Sacramente of Remembrance: And vvith that S. Chrysostome saith, Hoc Sacrificium, Exemplar illius est: This Sacrifice, is an Example of that Sacrifice. Thus the Death of Christe is renued before our eies. Yet Christe in deede neither is Crucified, nor dieth, nor sheaddeth his bloude, nor is Substantiallie Presente, nor Reallie Offered by the Priest. In this sorte the Councel saith, Christ is offered, ἀδύτως without Sacrifice. So Saint Augustine saith, Quod ab omnibus appellatur Sacrificium, Signum est Veri Sacrificij: The thinge, that of al menne is called a Sacrifice, is a Token, or a Signe of the True Sacrifice.

Conc. Nic.  
ἀδύτως  
δυσμενος

Contra  
Faustum  
lib. 20. ca.  
21. Chrys.  
in Epist.  
ad Hebraeos  
bomil. 17.

August.  
De Cuius.  
Dei. lib. 10.  
cap. 5.



Diuif. 1.

*A Reioindre to M. Iewels Replie*

De Confe.  
Dis. 2.  
Hoc est.

Sacrifice, *Likevvise againe he saith*, Vocatur ipsa Immolatio, quæ Sacerdotis manibus fit, Christi Passio, Mors, Crucifixio, non rei veritate, sed Significante Mysterio. The Sacrifice, that is wrought by the handes of the Priest, is called the Passion, the Death, the Crucifixeinge of Christ: not in deede, but by a Mysterie Signifiinge.

*And vvhere as M. Hardinge saith further*, Christ is offered onely in respecte of the presence of his Bodie, *Neither vvould the Real Presence, beinge graunted, importe the Sacrifice (for Christ vv as Really Presente in his Mothers Vvombe, and in the Cribbe, vvhere not vvithstanding he vv as no Sacrifice) nor hath M. Harding hitherto any vvaine prooued his Real Presence.*

*Hardinge.*

That the  
Sacrifice  
of the  
Aulter, is  
a true and  
real Sa-  
crifice;

The witnesse which I alledged out of the Nicen Council doth declare sufficietly, what I meant by saying, that Christ is sacrificed in the daily Sacrifice of the Church *truly, and in deede*, not in respecte of the manner of offering, but in respect of his very body and bloude, really, that is, in deede present. For the Sacrifice that was true and real in al respectes both of the inward substance, and also of the outward manner, was not made without bloudshed, and killing. This Sacrifice therefore of the Church being made without shedding of bloude or killing, lacketh that one point of that most perfite and true Sacrifice. Neuerthelesse for that it hath the substance of the bloody and moste absolutely perfite Sacrifice that was offred vpon the Crosse, it is in that consideration a true and real Sacrifice.

And right wel did I vnderstand, what I meant by these wordes M. Iewel, and so do you too, what so euer you say: but of a wilful and peruerse frowardnesse you would seme not to vnderstand them, that in worde you  
might

might reprove me, where in dede you found nothing to be reprov'd. Yet, who marketh you, shal perceiue, how you bewray your owne knowledge by thobiection you make against your self of the wordes of the Nicen Council, which you translate falsely into Latin, not englishing them, least they should seme to make, as they doo, for the Sacrifice, which ye denie. The Greke wordes be, ἀθύρως θυόμενος. Your vnttrue translation hath for them, thus: *sine sacrificio oblatus*, as much to say, offred vp without a Sacrifice. Which translation containeth in it a contradiction. For if Christ the true Lambe of God (as the Council calleth him) be offered vp, how is there not a Sacrifice? Therefore the true translation of these woordes ἀθύρως θυόμενος, had ben, *incrumentè sacrificatus*, sacrificed vnbloudily, or without bloude shedding, or, as a chiefe foun-  
M. Jewel  
falsifieth  
the Coun-  
cel of  
Nice.  
Occolam-  
padius.  
 der, and maintainer of your Sacramentarie doctrine hath turned, *non victimarum more sacrificatus*, sacrificed not after the manner of hostes (which be sacrificed with killing). And thus the place hath ben of learned men hitherto translated, neither was there euer any so shamelesse, as to swarue so farre from the right and natural sense of the wordes, as you doo, were he neuer so spiteful an enemy to that blessed Sacrifice.

This terme of the Nicen Council doth expresse the respect of the manner of offering which I spake of, to put a difference betwene the Sacrifice of the Crosse, and the daily Sacrifice of the Church: bicause the one was with shedding of bloud, and with death, the other without shedding of bloude, or death.

The same respecte of the manner of offering is vttered by the first Council of Ephesus. *Incrumentum celebramus*  
ἀθύρως  
 K

Concil. *bramus in Ecclesiis sacrificij cultum*, we doo celebrate in  
 Ephes. in our Churches the vnbloudy seruice of the Sacrifice.  
 Epist. ad The same doth Saint Augustine meane, writing, that *the*  
 Nestoriū. *flesh and bloude of the Sacrifice is celebrated by a Sacrament*  
 Aug. Cōt. *of remembrance*. The same doth S. Chrysostome vnder-  
 Faustum stand, where he saith, *Non aliud Sacrificium sicut pontifex,*  
 Manich. *sed id ipsum semper facimus, magis autem recordationem*  
 lib. 20. ca. *sacrificij facimus*. We make not a diuers sacrifice, as the  
 21. high bishop did, but alwaies the selfe same, yea rather  
 Chrysost. we celebrate a memorial of the Sacrifice.  
 in epist. ad

Heb. Ho-  
 mil. 17. Here is plainly expressed both the truth, and rea-  
 litie (if I may so cal it) of the Sacrifice alwaies and con-  
 tinuall offered, and also the manner of offering, be-  
 cause it is done in remembrance of the Sacrifice, that  
 was made vppon the Crosse. To be shorte, these  
 termes, *remembrance, token, signe, sampler, myste-  
 rie, sacrament*, and suche like, be oftentimes vsed of  
 the Fathers to expresse this manner of offering, and  
 in no wise to exclude the truth of the substance of the  
 thinge offered.

This notwithstanding M. Jewel, you are not asha-  
 med to pronounce, that the Councell of Nice, and  
 the olde Doctours, or holy Fathers, neuer vnder-  
 stood these respectes and manners. And whereas you  
 charge me with dazeling the Readers eyes with a  
 vaine distinction of clowdy wordes (so it liketh you  
 to control the doctrine of Christes Church) it is you,  
 that employe your whole witte and cunning to enuegle  
 and blinde Gods people, and to bereue them, wander-  
 ing in the wildernes of this world, of the true Manna,  
 that came downe from aboue al the clowdes, and  
 to

to dazel their vnderstandings so, that they may not discern the true body of our Lorde from bare bread, and by your phantastical, and vncertaine phrases applied out of place, to vndermine and shake no smal number of great and necessarie truthes by the Holy Ghoste founded, and so many hundred yeres susteined in Christes Church.

As for the authorities which you bring either to weaken the doctrine of the Church touching the Sacrifice of the Aulter, or to strengthen your owne contrary opinion, of how litle force they are, it is sone opened. First the Council of Nice maketh clearely for vs, which reporteth *the Lambe of God, that taketh away the synnes of the worlde to be situate upon the holy table* (whereby is meant the Aulter) *and of the Priestes to be sacrificed*, ἀθύρως, that is to say, without bloudshed, and not after the manner of beastes appointed to be killed in Sacrifice. Of these wordes you take a smal aduantage, and that only by false translation. For whereas the Council hath, *ὅτι ἐπὶ τῷ ἀθύρῳ ἐποιούμενος*, the Lambe is sacrificed of the Priestes vnbloudily, or, not after the manner of killed hostes: you turne it thus barely, *sine Sacrificio oblatus*, offered without sacrifice, but vntruly; as I haue said before. This place serueth you to no purpose, bicause false translation ought not to make proufe against the truth.

M. Ievv.  
taketh ad-  
uantage  
of his  
owne  
false trans-  
lation.

S. Augustines wordes against Faustus, you haue also falsified, and least you should be taken with the manner, you leaue out the Latine, and allege them onely in your owne English. Whereas he nameth *the flesh and bloude of this sacrifice*, least they might seme to importe

M. Ievv.  
falsifieth  
S. August.  
sine.  
Contra  
Faustum  
Manich.  
lib. 20.  
cap. 21.

a real presence of Cristes body and bloude, as they doo in dede: you haue put in steede therof, *the death of Christ*. Which declareth your meaning not to be simple and plaine, and the same in an other your selfe would not let passe, without note of vntrue dealing.

Chrysof.  
In epist.  
ad Heb.  
Hom. 17.

M. levv.  
falsifieth  
S. Chry-  
sostome  
by nips-  
ping.

And where S. Chrysofome saith, *Hoc sacrificium exemplar est illius*, this Sacrifice is a sampler of that Sacrifice: If you had meant good faith and truth, you would not so haue nipped that Father, and stopped him of his tale: For it foloweth in the same sentence immediatly, *id ipsum semper offerimus*, we offer alwaies that one selfe Sacrifice. And that we should knowe certaynely, that he meant not a signe or an example of the true sacrifice onely, as you doo, but the same it self in substance: he saith in the same place, *Pontifex noster ille est qui hostiam mundantem nos obtulit: ipsam offerimus & nunc, quae tunc oblata quidem consumi non potest*. He is our high Bishop, who hath offered vp the Sacrifice or hoste, that cleanseth vs: the same do we also offer now, which then being offered can not be consumed.

Hereupon might a plaine man demaunde of you, who is our high Bishop? Is it not Christ? what is that hoste or sacrifice, which purgeth and cleanseth vs from the filth of our synnes? Is it any other, then the precious body of Christ? What can you answer then to S. Chrysofom, saying, that we now also offer vp the same? And this is that, for which you make so much a doo at me for saying, that Christ is offered vp in the Sacrifice of the Church vnder the formes of breade and wine, truly, and in deede, not in respecte of the manner of offering, but in respecte of his very body and bloude.

really



really present. And thus my woordes, whiche you would so faine carpe, be grounded as you see, vpon a truth taught by the Councel of Nice, and by S. Chrysostome.

In the other place of S. Augustine you haue very fowly demeaned your selfe. You haue snatched a peece of a sentence out of him, and hauing framed it to an other sense then he meant by your common sleight of falsifying, and vntrue translation: you set it forth so, as to the vnlearned it may make some shew for your side, against the Catholike doctrine that we mainteine touching the Sacrifice of the Aulter. And some learned also may haply be deceiued, if they looke not better to your fingers, and by view and conferre of the booke, espie out your false legierdemaine. S. Augustine saith (say you) *Quod ab omnibus appellatur sacrificium, signum est veri sacrificij.* The thing, that of al menne is called a sacrifice, is a token, or signe of the true Sacrifice. Who reading these wordes, at the first being perswaded you haue plaid a true mans parte in alleging them, would not thinke, they made much for your negatiue doctrine, which denyeth the true and real Sacrifice of the Church, and auoucheth al that is done in the Masse, to be but a signe, a remembrance, and a voide representation? Voide I say, bicause ye take away the substance of the thing it selfe, to wit, the body and bloud of Christe.

M leuvel  
corrup-  
terh S. Au-  
gustine.

August. de  
ciuit. Dei  
lib. 10. ca.

Now S. Augustine in that place, neither speaketh as you make him speake, and much lesse meaneth he, as with your falsified allegation you would force vpon him. In that chapter he treateth of outward sacrifices, and of the inward, or spiritual sacrifices. And prefer-

S. Augus-  
tine tru-  
ly expos-  
ded.

ring the spiritual sacrifices before the other, he sheweth how the outward sacrifices made by the Fathers of the olde Testament with slaughter of beastes, were significations of our spiritual sacrifices, that is to say, of those things which be done by vs to this ende, that we cleaue vnto God, and that vnto the same ende we helpe forward our neighbour. Of these he saith, that God requireth them, and that he is wel pleased with them: Of the other, that he requireth not them, nor hath great liking in them.

De ciuit.  
lib. 10.  
cap. 5.  
Osea. 6.

Heb. 13.

After certaine places alleged out of the Scriptures for declaration and proufe hereof, at length he commeth to the woordes, whereof you would take holde against this special, and singular Sacrifice of the Church, and saith: *Per hoc, ubi scriptum est, misericordiam magis volo, quam Sacrificium, nihil aliud quam Sacrificium Sacrificio praelatum oportet intelligi: quoniam illud quod ab hominibus appellatur sacrificium, signum est veri sacrificij. Porro autem misericordia verum Sacrificium est, unde dictum est, quod paulo ante commemorauimus, Talibus enim sacrificijs placatur Deus.* Whereas it is written, I would haue mercie, rather then sacrifice, hereby we must vnderstand nothingels, but that sacrifice is preferred before sacrifice: forasmuch as that, which is called sacrifice of men, is a signe of a true sacrifice. And as for mercie, it is a true sacrifice. In consideration whereof it is said, whereof I spake euen now, with such sacrifices (that is to saye, with almose and deedes of charitie) God is appeased.

In the ende of that discourse he concludeth thus. *Quaecunque igitur &c.* Whatso euer thinges therefore we reade so haue

to haue bene commaunded by God diuers waies concerning sacrifices in the ministerie of the Tabernacle, or of the Temple, they are referred to the loue of God, and of our neighbour thereby to be signified.

By due conference and consideration of this whole place, and of the discourse there treated, thou maist euidently see good Reader, how litle M. Iewel is to be trusted, when he bringeth ought out of any olde Doctor, that semeth not to agree with the doctrine of the Catholike Church. He would thee to beleue, that S. Augustine spake of the special and singular Sacrifice of the Church, whereof we treat, which Sacrifice indeed is of al men called a sacrifice: and worthily, for so it is. But that by verditte of S. Augustine it is a signe of the true Sacrifice, as though thereby were meant, the same not to be the true Sacrifice, and therefore no true and real Sacrifice at al: therein lyeth much falshood. For neither speaketh Saint Augustine there of the Sacrifice of the Church, neither vnderstandeth he by a true sacrifice, the chiefe and most true Sacrifice, which is that of the Crosse, but any spiritual sacrifice in general, wherein the effect of loue toward God, or our neighbour is performed. And therefore he much abuseth the simplicity of the vnlearned Reader by his fustle and false translation, turning, *illud quod ab hominibus appellatur Sacrificium*, that which of men is called a sacrifice, whereby S. Augustine vnderstandeth any of the Sacrifices of the olde Law, into, *illud quod ab omnibus appellatur Sacrificiū &c.* The thing, that of al men is called a sacrifice, is a tokē, or a signe of the true Sacrifice: whereby he induceth the Reader to conceiue the Sacrifice of the Church, and to beleue

beleue the same not to be a true and real Sacrifice, but only a signe of the true Sacrifice. And in that he turneth *signum veri Sacrificij*, a signe or token of the true Sacrifice, he meaneth Christe offered vpon the Crosse, otherwise then S. Augustine did: whereas he should haue translated it thus, A signe of a true sacrifice. And what is there meant by a true sacrifice, he could not be ignorant. For it foloweth immediatly, *Porro autem misericordia verum sacrificium est*, mercie is a true sacrifice.

Differēce  
betwene  
a true, ad,  
the True  
Sacrifice

August. de  
ciuit. Dei  
lib. 10.  
cap. 20.

And who perceiueth not a difference betwene these two, whether we say, a True Sacrifice, or the True Sacrifice? Any spiritual sacrifice, is a true Sacrifice. The true Sacrifice, properly to speake, is Christe him selfe. Which S. Augustine, after that he hath treated of Sacrifices at large, calleth, *Summum & verum sacrificium*, the highest, principal, or chiefe, and the True Sacrifice, whereof the Sacrifice of the Church (saith he) is a sacrament. The same Sacrifice of the Church, may also be called the True Sacrifice, though not in respect of the olde commō maner of offering, which was by killing the hoste offred: yet in respecte of the thing offred, which by vertue of the woorde is made really present, which is the same flesh and bloude, that was offered and shed vpon the Crosse. Here it is not so offred, nor shed, but that offering and bloud shedding, that is to say, the death of Christ, is represented and recorded. The Sacrifice of the Crosse is the True Sacrifice in respect both of the thing offered, and of the common manner of offering, for there Christ was killed: the Sacrifice of the Altar, which is the Sacrifice of the Church, is also the True Sacrifice in respect of the thing offered which is the body and bloud

bloude of Christe, as truly present in the Sacrament, though inuifibly, as vpon the Crosse, where it was visibly, albe it in respect of the olde common manner of sacrificing, it is not a Sacrifice after that manner, and therefore is it called *sacrificium incruentum*, the vnbloudy Sacrifice.

An other manner there is, singuler, special, and proper to this mystical Sacrifice, after whiche it is made, sacrificed, and offered, so as the Mysterie that Christ instituted, requireth: which they knowe, that haue grace rightly to beleue. Of which manner *Oecumenius* saith, *Christus in Mystica cœna modum illis tradidit huiusmodi Sacrificij*. Christe deliuered vnto Priestes the manner of such a Sacrifice. This manner hath euer ben, and is to this day obserued, euen as the Apostles were taught it of Christe, and as the Church hath receiued it of the Apostles, and offereth the new Oblation of the newe Testament in the whole worlde, as *S. Ireneus* writeth. *Eusebius* speaking of the manner of this sacrifice, calleth it *Melchisedeks* manner, and saith, in one place, it is offered after the newe Mysteries of the newe Testament, in another place, after the Ecclesiasticall ordinances.

As for that *S. Augustine* saith, *The Sacrifice that is made by the handes* (that is to say, ministerie) *of the Priest, is called the Passion, the death, the Crucifying, not in truth of the thing, but in Mysterie signifying*: I graunt it to be true, and such, as may wel serue for answer to certaine blasphemous obiections made by the Sacramentaries against this Sacrifice. How this maketh any proufe for your doctrine, I see not. For though the Sacrifice be called sometimes by the name of the Passion, the Death, and

L cruci-

*Oecum. in Epist. ad Heb. ca. 5.*

*Iren. lib. 4. cap. 32. Euseb. de demonstr. lib. 1. & lib. 5. De Consecr. Dist. 2. Hoc est.*



Cyprian.  
lib. 2. epist.  
3.

crucifying of Christe (as S. Cyprian saith, *Passio est Do-  
mini sacrificium quod offerimus*, The Sacrifice that we of-  
fer is the Passion of our lorde) because it representeth  
and reneweth the memorie of the Passion once performed  
and done, whereas in deede it is not the sensible Passion,  
death or Crucifying, but the same is signified in mysterie,  
for that the body which suffred, died, and was crucified,  
is truly exhibited: yet this taketh not away the truth of  
a Sacrifice. Such a great Logician, as you would seme to  
be, wil not make this childish Argument, I dare say:  
That whiche the Priest maketh, signifieth the Passion  
and Death of Christe, and is not the Passion and Death  
in deede: Ergo, it is not a Sacrifice. That it be a true  
and real Sacrifice, it is not necessary, that Christe suf-  
fer againe, and be slaine: it is yenough the body of  
Christe that once suffred, and was slaine, be truly ex-  
hibited, and offered vnto God. Which is done in our  
Mysterie by them, who haue commaundement to doo,  
that Christe did, when he said, *Doo this in my remem-  
brance*.

In the ende of this your first Diuision you say, that  
*Neither would the Real presence being granted, importe  
the Sacrifice, nor that I haue hitherto any waie prooued  
the Real presence*, which after your scoffing custome  
you cal my *Real presence*, as though it had not ben taught  
by the cleare scriptures, by al the olde learned Fathers,  
and vniuersally beleued of Christen people, til the wic-  
ked generation of the Sacramentaries came. But sir,  
whether the Real presence of Christe, where so euer it  
be, do importe a sacrifice or no, it is impertinent to our  
purpose here to dispute. How be it I am not ignorant,  
that

that there want not learned men, who holde, that Christes body from the time it was first fourmed in, and of the body of the blessed virgin his mother, neuer ceased, nor shal cease to be a sacrifice, according as S. Paule to the Hebrewes alleging the prophecie vttered in the Psalme, teacheth, *Ingrediens mundum, dicit, ho-* Hebr. 10.  
*stiam & oblationem noluiſti, corpus autem aptaſti mihi.* Psalm. 39.  
Christe entring into the worlde, saith, Sacrifice and oblation thou wouldest not haue, but a body thou hast made fitte for me.

To your position briefly I answer, that although the Real presence of Christe in other places, and times imported not a sacrifice, yet the same in the Sacrament doth necessarily inferre a sacrifice, because according to the general teaching of al the Fathers, Christe did institute it not onely to be receiued as a necessary foode, but also to be offered as an healthful Sacrifice, *medica-* Cyprian. de  
*mentum & holocaustum existens ad sanandas infirmitates,* Can. Dom.  
*& purgandas iniquitates,* being a medicine and sacrifice to heale infirmities, and to purge iniquities, as S. Cyprian saith. He taught the new oblation of the new Testament, saith S. Irenæus, Lib. 4. 32.

That I haue sufficiently proued, the Real presence of Christes body and bloude in the Sacrament, the Answer I made to the fifth Article of your Challenge, doth witnes to as many as be not lead with lewde and blind affection to your syde. As for the shiftes of your Replie thereunto, they are so detected, and fully confuted, and the Real presence otherwise so substantially proued by M. D. Saunder, and M. D. Heskins, that euery meane witte may easely see the weaknes of your cause.

The. 2. Diuision.

The Answer.

**T**He two first manners of the offeringe of Christe, our aduersaries acknowledge and confesse. The thirde they denie vtterly. And so they robbe the Church of the greatest treasure it hath or may haue, the Bodie and Bloud of our Sauour Christe once offered vpon the Crosse with paineful suffering for our redemption, and now daieley offered in the blessed Sacramente in remembrance. For which we haue so many proufes, as for no one pointe of our Christian religion moe. And herein I am more encombred with store, then straighted with lacke, and doubt more, what I may leaue, then what I may take. Wherefore thinking it shal appeare to the wise more skille, to shewe discretion in the choise of places, rather then learning in recital of number, though we are ouer peartely thereto prouoked by M. Iuelles vauntinge and insolent challenge: I intende herein to be short, verily shorter, then so large a mater requireth: and to bring for proufe a fewe suche auctorities (I meane a fewe in respect of the multitude that might be brought) as ought in euery mannes iudgement to be of great weight, and estimation.

Jewel.

Touching the Oblation of Christes Bodie, wee beleue, and Confesse as much, as the holy Ghost hath opened in the Scriptures. VVhere as M.

Harding

Harding saith, Christes Bodie is offred vp by the Priest vnto God the Father, in remembrance of that Bodie, that Christe himselfe offered vpon the Crosse. He seemeth not to consider the inconsistency, and solfe of his owne tale. For it is vvel knovven to al Creatures, not onely Christians, but also Iewes, Turckes, and Saracenes, that Christe was Crucified vpon the Crosse: But that Christe should be sacrificed by a Mortal man, Inuisibly, and, as they say, vnder the Formes of Bread, and vvine, and that Really, and in deede, it is a thinge so far passinge the common sense of Christian knowvledge, that the best learned, and vviseest of the Ancient learned Christian Fathers could neuer knowv it.

Therefore this is, not onely the proouing of a thinge knovven, by a thinge vnknoovven: and of a thinge moste certaine, by a thinge vncertaine: but also the Confirmation of a manifest Trueth, by an open Errour.

Neither do vvee robbe the Church of God of that most Heauenty, and moste comfortable Sacrifice of Christes Bodie: But rather vvee open, and disclose the errours, vvherevvith certaine of late yeeres haue vvilfully deceiued the Church of God. Vvee knovv, That Christes Bodie was rente for our Sinnes, and that by his VVounds wee are made whole: That Christe in his Bodie caried our Sinnes vpon the Tree: And by the Oblation thereof, once made vpon the Crosse, bath sanctified vs for euer, and hath purchased for vs euerlastinge Redéption: And That there is none other Name (or Sacrifice) vnder Heauen, whereby wee can be saued, but onely the name (and Sacrifice) of Iesus Christe. I reckon. vvho so teacheth this Doctrine, leaueth not the Church of God vvithout a Sacrifice.

Touchinge the multitude of Authorities, vvherevvith M. Harding findeth him selfe so muche encombred, the greater his stoare is, the more vvill vvise men require his discretion, and skil in the choise. His choise vvill seeme vnskilful; if he allege his Authorities biside his purpose. His purpose, and promise is to prooue, that the Priest hath good vvarrant, to offer vp Christe the Sonne of God vnto his Father. VVhiche purpose if he neuer vouchsafes once to touche, but range abroad, as his manner is, and roauie idley at maters impertinent, then muste vvee needes say, He bevvraieeth his vvante, and bringeth his greate Stoare

E(ay. 53.  
1. Pet. 2.  
Heb. 9.  
Act 17. 4.

Diuif. 2.

A Reioindre to M. Jewels Replie

out of credit. So shal the offer, that is gently made him, seeme to stande vpon good, and conuenient termes, of Trueth, and Modestie. So (hal his boaresful Vaunte of al thinges, persourning nothing, vnto the wise (to vse his ovvne vvordes) seeme pearte, and insolent.

Harding.

M. Jewel  
faineth  
me to say,  
that I say  
not, and  
thereto di-  
recteth his  
Replie,

In your 2. Diuision though you be shorte, yet you spende many moe wordes, then either were nedeful, or imported any direct answer, reason, or learning. You pretend that to be said by me, which I say not, and then as your manner is, fighting with my shadow, which you set before you by your owne fained imagination, you come not to answer the point directly, but speake al-ther inconsideratly.

Had that bene my tale, whiche you tel for me, wherein shewe you inconstancie and folie to be in it, whereof you note the same? For (say you), *not onely Christians, but also Iewes, Turkes, Saracens* (you might haue added also the Deuil, whose knowledge is great) know, that *Christe was crucified vpon the Crosse*. This much I graunt, what conclude you? But (say you againe) *that he is sacrificed by a mortal man inuisibly, vnder the formes of bread and wine, the auncient Fathers could neuer know it*. Here I stoppe you, and this I denie. And what cause I haue to denie it, I haue in the Diuision before shewed. After this you come vnto your Conclusion, wherein appeareth in deede both the inconstancie and folie of your tale. Therefore (say you of me in effecte) *I prooue a thing knownen by a thing vnknownen, and a thing certaine by a thing uncertaine, and* con-



confirm manifest truth by open error.

Here if I would follow you, and set forth the peevishnes of your Argument, by telling you, how the *Maior*, or first Proposition is impertinent, the *Minor* false, being the Negatiue of our Question (which being denied of me, was very absurdly brought by you in the Premisses) nor Moode, nor Figure, nor iust disposition of the termes duely obserued, the Conclusion not following of the Premisses in right order of a *Syllogismus*: I should bestowe many woordes to prooue that a foolish Argument, whiche thereof without any curiouse shewing of Logique, of it selfe geueth witness.

What leadeth you to thinke, that by the vnbloudy Sacrifice of the Church, which you cal a thing vncertaine, I go about to prooue the Sacrifice of the Crosse, whiche I graunt to be certaine, and to confirme that most manifest truth by this other Sacrifice, which you, and they of your side denie? By what one worde can you gather, that to haue bene myne intent? If it were not, as most certainly it was not (for what neede was there to bring any proufe for the Sacrifice of Christe vpon the Crosse?) why bestow you so many wordes to prooue your beleefe touching that Sacrifice?

I said not that ye robbed the Church of the Sacrifice done vpon the Crosse (For of that being now paste, how can ye robbe the Church?) But of the body and bloude of Christe, as it is daily offered at the Aulter in remembrance of his Death and Passion: of the Presence of the body and bloud, and of the Sacrifice of the same in mysterie, which the Church from the Apostles time  
hitherto

hitherto hath euer celebrated, you robbe the Church,  
and of that spake I expressely, as my wordes be plaine,  
and thereof your selfe could not be ignorant.

*Whether the Sacramentaries rob the Church  
of her greatest treasure.*

But how doo you auoide the crime of spoiling the  
Church of her greatest treasure? Bicause forsooth ye  
know and teach, that Christe suffered death for vs vpon  
the Crosse. As though the Heretikes haue not alwaies  
acknowledged, and confessed the same. Arius con-  
fessed Christe was God, and the Sonne of God: yet he  
robbed him of his equalitie of Godhed, of his coeterni-  
tie, and of his consubstantialitie with God his Father.  
In like sorte although ye beleue neuer so constantly, and  
preach neuer so earnestly, that Christe shed his bloude,  
and died for vs vpon the Crosse: yet shal ye be accom-  
pited to robbe the Church of her chiefe treasure; onlesse  
ye leaue vnto her the real flesh and bloude of Christe:  
by oblation, and participation whereof, the effect of the  
Sacrifice made vpon the Crosse, is transferred vnto vs.

Ye shal defraude her touching foode; *Alimonia im-*  
*mortalitatis, & portione vite aeterna*, of the foode of im-  
mortalitie, and of the portion of life euerlasting, as S.  
Cyprian saith: *Pane vite, epulo incorrupto*, of the bread  
of life, of the banquet that is incorruptible, as Origen  
writeth: *Of the Pledges of our Resurrection*, as the Niceni  
Council determineth: *Of the flesh verely geuing life, and*  
*proper to the Worde it selfe*, as the Council of Ephesus de-  
clarerth: to be shorte, *of the meate of Angels*, as S. Ambros  
testifierth.

Cyprian.  
de cena  
Domini.  
Origen. in  
Lucam.  
Hom. 38.  
Concilium  
Nicenum.  
Concilium  
Ephesin.

Ye shal rob her touching the Sacrifice, *Hostia salu-* Diony. Ec-  
tari, of the healthful Hoste, as S. Dionyse calleth it: of *clesia*. His  
the permanent and alwaies continuing burnt offering, as S. *rarch. c. 3.*  
Cyprian esteemeth it: of the Sacrifice of our Raunsome, *Augu. lib.*  
as S. Augustine termeth it: Finally of the Lambe of God, *9. Confessi.*  
that taketh away the sinnes of the worlde, as the Councel *cap. 12.*  
of Nice teacheth. *Cuncil.*

*Nicen.*

What iudge you? They that violently take from the  
Church of Christe these thinges, seme they not to rob  
her of the gratest treasure she hath, though they preach  
that Christe died vpon the Crosse for vs neuer so busily?  
Doo they not leaue her without a Sacrifice, and there-  
fore without a Religion, according vnto S. Cyprians  
mynde? Doo not they take the next way to abolishe  
that, which faith and cōtrition presupposed, is the chiefest  
meane to apply vnto vs the benefite of Christes death,  
by abolishing the daily Sacrifice? S. Gregorie saith, *Quo-* Gregor:  
*ties ei hostiam sua passionis offerimus, toties nobis ad absolu-* Hom. 37.  
*tionem nostram ipsius passionem reparamus.* As often as  
we offer vnto him the Sacrifice of his passion, so ofte  
doo we repaire and renew vnto our selfe his passion to  
our absolution. *Dialog.*

*4. cap. 58.*

Al this notwithstanding, touching the Oblation of Chri-  
stes body, you saye, that ye beleue and confesse as much,  
as the Holy Ghoste hath opened in the Scriptures. But  
how vntruly this is spoken, who vnderstandeth not? For  
the holy Ghost hath opened in the Gospel, that Christe  
made an Oblation of his body and bloude at his last Sup-  
per, which you M. Iewel, and your felowes wil not be-  
leue. That Christe made such a Sacrifice, and that the  
same is reueled in the Gospel, if you wil not beleue the

That  
Christ of-  
fered vp  
his body  
at his last  
Supper.

Catholike Church, that is to be beleued before any one  
 August. in man: yet may it please you to beleue S. Augustine with  
 Psalm. 33. these woordes recording the same. *Erat ut nostis, Sacri-*  
 Concio, 1. *ficiū Iudaorum anteā secundum ordinem Aaron in victi-*  
*mis pecorum, & hoc in mysterio. Nondum enim erat sacrifici-*  
*cium corporis & sanguinis, quod fideles nōrunt, & qui Euan-*  
*gelium legerunt, quod sacrificium nunc diffusum est toto orbe*  
*terrarum.* The sacrifice of the Iewes was, as ye knowe  
 before, after the order of Aaron in Sacrifices of brute  
 beastes, and that in mysterie. For the Sacrifice of the  
 body and bloude ( of Christe ) which the faithfull, and  
 they that haue read the Gospel do know, was not as yet.  
 The which Sacrifice is now dispersed abroad in the  
 whole worlde.

The Sa-  
 crifice of  
 Christe  
 auouched  
 in the  
 Gospel, in  
 the iudge-  
 ment of  
 S. Augus-  
 tine.

Sacrifice  
 spread ou-  
 er the  
 worlde.

Now marke good Reader, S. Augustine saith, that the  
 faithfull, and so many as haue perused the Gospel, doo  
 knowe the Sacrifice of the body and bloud of Christe.  
 What shal we say then? Is not that Sacrifice opened by  
 the holy Ghoste in the Scriptures? And least any man  
 should mystake him, and thinke him to speake of the Sa-  
 crifice of Christes body and bloud, made vpo the Crosse,  
 on the mounte of Caluarie, without the gates of Ierusa-  
 lem: he declarēth his meaning, and nameth plainly the  
 Sacrifice, which is now spread and made thorough out the  
 whole worlde. Which Sacrifice of Christes body and  
 bloude can be none other, but that which the Church  
 hath ben accustomed to offer vpo God in the Masse,  
 vnder the visible formes of bread and wine, in remem-  
 brance of Christes Passion, Resurrection, Ascension, and  
 other his great benefites.

Caul not M. Iewel vpon wordes, commonly vsed by  
 the

the Church for a more certaine explication, and the better to repel the wrangling obiections of the Sacramentarie Heretikes, sithens the tyme of Berégarius. The Sacrifice that we defende, is (which S. Augustine confesseth) the Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe, which succeded the Sacrifices of the Iewes, that were of brute beastes, which al Christian people, and the faithful that read the newe Testamente, doo acknowledge and confesse, which is now frequented and celebrated in al partes of the worlde, where so euer the voice of the Gospel hath bene sounded, and receiued.

Touching the stoare of auctorities, that may be alleged for good witnesse of this Sacrifice, though your sprite stirreth you to scoffe at it, how great it is, and of what number they are: vnto the learned it is not vnknown. And suche witnesses as I brought, how aptely they serue to this purpose, and how directly thei strike the marke: it doth already (I doubt not) appeare to such, as with an indifferent eye haue perused myne Aunswere to this your seuenteenth Article. And more euidently it shal appeare with Gods grace by this processe, when the weakenes and falshood of your Replie shal be detected, and thereby it shal be prooued, that your vaine Challenge being too malepertly and presumptuously made, standeth neither vpon good, nor conuenient termes, but vpon a deuilish denial, vnmeete to procede out of any Christian mans mouth.



**T**He Scripture it selfe ministring euident proufe for the Oblatiō of Christ to his Father by the Priestes of the New Testament, in the Institution of this Holy Sacrament, in the figure of Melchisedech, and in the Prophecie of Malachie the Prophete: the authorities of the Fathers needed not to be alleaged, were not the same Scripture by the ouerthwarte, and false interpretations of our aduersaries wrested, and tourned to a contrary sense, to the horrible seducing of the vnlerned.

Jewel.

Alas, vvhhat toole is there so vveake, that M. Harding vvill refuse, to strike vvithal? To prouue his imagined Kind of Sacrifice, he hath brought vs forth out of his great stoare, the example of Melchisedech, and the Prophecie of Malachie: As if he vvould reason thus, God saith vnto Christ, Thou arte a Priest for euer according to the order of Melchisedek: Or, God saith by the Prophete Malachie, A pure Oblation shalbe offred vnto me in euery place: Ergo, The Priest hath Authoritie, and power, to offer vp the Sonne of God vnto his Father. If he had not had good choise, and stoare of Authorities, he vvould neuer haue begonne vvith these.

*Psal. 110.  
Malac. 1.*

But he addeth further, as mater of greenance, That these plaine Scriptures, by the ouerthwarte, and false Interpretations of his Aduersaries, are wreasted, and turned to a contrary sense, and that, (as he saith) to the horrible seducing of the vnlerned. Doubtlesse here is a very horrible accusation. How be it, if vve happely had mistaken these places, and our error therein vvere fully proued: yet should not M. Harding in such horrible termes reprove vs, for doing that thing once, that he, and his selouyes doo so often. But by vvhat vvordes, by vvhat false Interpretation, into vvhat peruerse or Heretical Sense, haue vve so horribly vvreasted these Scriptures? M. Harding is vvise, is eloquent,

eloquent, is watchful, is circumspecte, is fast addicted vnto his cause: he dissembleth, and leaueth nothing, that any way may serue his purpose. If our Errours be so horrible, he should not haue spared them: If there be none, he should not thus haue touched them. If M. Hardinge winkes at them, who can see them? If M. Hardinge know them not, who can know them?

Harding.

Whether my tooles be weake, as you ieast, or of good strength, let it be iudged by the strokes they geue, with which doubteles the heresie that ye sustaine aganst the outward and figular Sacrifice of the Church, is stricken downe, and quite ouerthrowen. And the same tooles haue the chiefe Doctours and auncient Fathers of the Church vsed before me. By the tooles I meane, as you doo, the Figure of Melchisedech, and the Prophecie of Malachie: by which the doctrine of the Church concerning the Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe, is auouched. And here to enter into that special point, little esteeming your other impertinent talke, which you thinke toucheth my person, and wise men see helpeth not your cause: directing my wordes to the Reader, of whom I may conceiue better hope then I doo of you: thus I say.

The Argument which M. Iewel here maketh as on my behalfe, albeit to the learned, who knowe and vnderstand the circumstances of the figure of Melchisedech, and of the prophecie of Malachie, concludeth sufficiently and fully: yet thou maist be wel assured good Reader, I would neuer my selfe haue proponed it so nakedly, and without any declaration of the necessary circumstances. Although there folow hereafter more proper places to open the figure of Melchisedech, and the

prophecie of Malachie, where I bring them in for proufe of this intent : yet bicaufe M. Iewel hath by preuention abruptly fallen into them, and to the ende noman be deceiued by his cutted argument, which in deede is good, if the circumstances were not guilefully conceeled: here I thinke good to vtter some of those circumstances.

To beginne therfore with Melchisedech: It may please thee Reader to vnderstand, that he is recorded in the

Gen. 14. Scripture to be a Priest of God the highest. Then being a Priest, it behoued him to offer Sacrifice according vnto

Heb. 7. S. Pauls doctrine, *Euery Bishop (or Priest) taken from among men, is for men appointed in those things that belong to God to offer vp giftes and sacrifices for sinnes.* What sacrifice then did he offer? He offered vp bread and wine, as

That Mel-  
chisedek  
offered  
bread and  
wine.  
Arnob. in  
Psal. 109. Arnobius that auncient Father, beside sundry other Doctors doth witnesse, notwithstanding the Scripture make plaine and expresse mention only of bringing forth bread and wine. His wordes be these. *Christus per mysterium panis & vini sacerdos factus est secundum ordinem Melchisedech, qui panem & vinum solus obtulit in sacerdotibus, dum Abraham Victor reuerteretur de pralip.* By the myste-

Cyprian.  
epist. ad  
Ceciliū.  
lib. 2. epi-  
stola. 3. stola. 3. rour from bataile. *This order* (saith S. Cyprian speaking of the order of Melchisedech) *is here comming of that sacrifice, (he meaneth Melchisedeks sacrifice) and descending from thens, that Melchisedech was the priest of the highest God, that he offered bread and wine, that he blessed Abraham.*

Here it is expressely affirmed, that Melchisedech offered bread and wine, and moreouer that Christ by doing the

the like, was made a Priest according to the order of the same Melchisedek.

*That Christe at his Supper shewed him selfe a priest after the order of Melchisedek.*

But when, and where did Christe beginne to shewe him selfe a Prieste in offering sacrifice after that Order? Verely at his last Supper: For of that he did vpon the Crosse, whereof the Sacrifice of the Supper taketh his merite, now I speake not. And that he did so at his laste Supper, S. Hierome in his Commentaries vpon the. 26. chapter of S. Matthew, is an euident witnesse, where he saith thus. *Postquam typicum Pascha fuerat impletum, & Agni carnes cum Apostolis comederat, assumit panem, qui confortat cor hominis, & ad verum Pascha transgreditur sacramentum, ut quomodo in praefiguratione eius Melchisedech summi Dei sacerdos, panem & vinum offerens fecerat, ipse quoque veritatem sui corporis & sanguinis repraesentaret.* After that the figuratiue Pascheouer had ben fulfilled, and he had eaten with his Apostles the flesh of the Lambe, he tooke vnto him breade, that strengtheneth the harte of man, and passeth ouer vnto the true Sacrament of Pascheouer, that like as Melchisedech the Priest of the highest God had done in offering bread and wine in a foregoing figure of him: so he him selfe also might represent the truth of his body and bloude. Who can more plainly vtter this mater, then S. Hierome hath done in these wordes, expressely saying, that Christ executed in deede at his last Supper that Priesthode, which Melchisedech did prefigure, when hauing taken bread, he represented, that is to say, presently exhibited; not, the figure or signe, as Zwinglius and Oecolampadius teach, nor the po-

Hieron. in  
Mat. 26.

wer



wer and vertue, as Caluine teacheth, but the truth of his body and bloude.

Cyprian.  
lib. 2. epi.  
stola. 3.

S. Cyprian speaking of that Christe did at his last Supper, auoucheth the same thing with woordes of like effecte. *Qui magis sacerdos Dei summi, quàm Dominus noster Iesus Christus, qui sacrificiũ Deo patri obtulit, & obtulit hoc idem, quod Melchisedech, id est, panẽ & vinũ, suũ scilicet corpus & sanguinem?* Who is more a Priest of the highest God, then our Lorde Iesus Christe, who offered a Sacrifice to God the Father, and offered the same, that Melchisedech did that is to wit, bread and wine, as much to say, his body and bloude.

Consider Reader, when Saint Cyprian had said, that Christe offered the same sacrifice that Melchisedech had offered, which was, bread and wine: least any man shoulde mistake his meaning, and thinke, that Christe offered none other, nor better thing, then breade and wine, and in so doing should not excel Melchisedech: he addeth an interpretation of his owne woordes, to wit, that although Christes offering appeared to be bread and wine, yet in deede it was his body and blood. Wherefore if thou wilt acknowledge Christes excellencie aboue Melchisedech, and folow the interpretation, that S. Cyprian putteth vpon his owne woordes: thou must beleue Christe and Melchisedech to offer one and the same thing in outward forme, and in mysterie or sacrament, but not one in substance and truth. The premisses considered, it is most certaine, that Christ fulfilling the figure of Melchisedech at his Maundie, offered his body and bloude, that is to say, him selfe vnto his Father.

Let



Let vs go a steppe foreward, and consider one circumstance more, whereby it may appeare, that priestes also haue auctoritie to offer vp Christ vnto his Father. How wil that appeare? Forsooth bicause Christ, after that he had offered his body and bloude him selfe, and deliuered the same vnto his Apostles, gaue them withal a commaundement to doo the same, saying, *Doo ye this in remembrance of me*. No man, be he neuer so great an enemy vnto the continual Sacrifice of the Church, wil denie, but that the Apostles had a warrant geuen them by this commaundement requiring them to doo, that they had sene their Lorde and Maister to haue done before them. But it is proued already by sufficient authorities, that Christe at his Supper did offer his body and blood vnto his Father: *Ergo* the Apostles had warrant to offer Christes bodie and bloude vnto God his Father.

Nowe let vs descende one steppe lower, and we shal come vnto the very point, at whiche M. Iewel vnlearnedly, and wickedly maketh suche a woondering, as if it were a monstrous, and most dangerous presumption, which is, that a priest hath auctoritie to offer vp Christe vnto his Father. It is therefore to be vnderstanded, that Christe gaue not this commaundement, and through vertue of the same a warrant, to doo the thing he had him selfe done before vnto his Apostles onely, but also vnto such as should succede them in office of Priesthode (whereunto they were admitted by Christe at the maundie) to the worldes ende. Which truth S. Paule doth insinuate, where he speaketh of this blessed Sacrament, shewing that it must be celebrated in remembrance of his death vntil his

That  
priestes  
haue auctoritie  
to offer  
vp Christ  
vnto his  
Father.  
Luc. 22.  
1. Cor. 11.

1. Cor. 11.

N

last

Conti-  
nuance of  
Priestes  
necessary

last comming. Whereof this argument is easily gathered.

Our lordes Supper is to be celebrated vntil his last comming. But that can not be performed, onlesse some succede the Apostles in the office, by vertue whereof it is done: *Ergo* it is necessary, that some succede the Apostles in that officē. The first proposicion is proued by S. Paule. The second is manifest, bicause the Apostles, to whom the commaundement was geuen, were not to continue a liue in the Church vntil Christes second comming. That commaundement therfore was geuen as wel vnto them who should succede, as vnto the Apostles them selues: For that any should take vpon, them to execute so high an office, who haue no commaundement thereto, or that the commaundement was geuen to al in general, it is to absurde to thinke.

Priestes  
by special  
calling  
succede  
the Apost  
les in  
degree.  
Hieron. ad  
Heliodo-  
rum.

To whom then hath this office ben cōmitted? By what name haue these successours ben called? Verely it hath ben cōmitted to the Priestes of the Church, and to none els. Of this special calling and cōdition of certaine, S. Hierome geueth vs an euident witnes, saying. *Ab sit ut de ijs quicquam sinistrum loquar, qui Apostolico gradu succedētes, Christi corpus sacro ore conficiunt, per quos & nos Christiani sumus.* God forbid I should speake ought amisse of them, who succeding into the degree of the Apostles, with their sacred mouth make the body of Christ, by whom also we be made Christians. Thus we are taught, that it is the office of Priestes, to make or consecrate the precious body of Christe by vertue of his woorde, by them, as Ministers, and substitutes of Christe pronounced, for which S. Hierome acknowlegeth their mouth to be sacred and holy, and for the same dignitie, confesseth them

them to succede the Apostles in that degree.

To the like effecte we finde in S. Cyprian a testimonie worthy of note. *Si Christus summus Sacerdos Sacrificium Deo Patri ipse primus obtulit, & hoc fieri in sui commemorationem precepit: utique ille sacerdos vice Christi verè fungitur, qui id quod Christus fecit, imitatur.* If Christe the highest priest him self did first offer the sacrifice vnto God his Father, and comaunded the same to be done in remembrance of him: then that Priest doth truely supply the steede of Christ, which foloweth that which Christ did.

Cyprian.  
lib. 2. ep. 3.

Priestes,  
substitutes  
of  
Christe.

This saying of S. Cyprian goeth somewhat hygher, then the former of S. Hierome. There it was said, that Priestes succeded in Apostolike degree. Here a Priest folowing the acte of Christ in offering the Sacrifice, is said to be the substitute of Christ him selfe. By S. Hieromes verdict they may consecrate the body of Christ, as the successors of the Apostles: by S. Cyprians doctrine they may offer the Sacrifice, as the Vicars of Christ. What thinke we then? May any Christian man sauing his profession, imagine, yea beleue, and openly by preaching, and writing publish vnto the worlde, that the Apostles successors, and Christes substitutes want auctoritie and commission to doo that, vnto thoffice whereof they succede, and be substitutes?

Now let these circumstances be gathered, and set together in fewer wordes, so shal the necessary sequele the better be perceiued. Melchisedech was a priest, and figure of Christ by offering bread and wine. Christ fulfilled this figure at his Maundie by consecrating, and offering his bodie and bloude vnder the formes of Breade and Wine vnto his Father, him selfe being

N ij the

the true bread of life, that came downe from heauen: and gaue commaundement and auctoritie to his Apostles, and to their successours, to do the same in remembrance of him: The successours of the Apostles in this behalfe be the Priestes of the newe Testament: *Ergo*, the Priestes haue a commaundement, and thereby sufficient auctoritie, to doo that Christe did at his Maundie, that is, to consecrate and offer the body and bloud of Christ vnto his Father. And so to conclude, these circumstances thus considered, doo clearly prooue to the detection of M. Iewels either blinde ignorance, or cankred malice against the Church, this to be a good and true consequent, which he proponed as absurde and ridiculous: *God the Father saith vnto Christe, Thou arte a priest for euer after the order of Melchisedech: Ergo the Priest hath auctoritie and power to offer vp Christ vnto his Father.*

*That the Prophecie of Malachie foresheweth  
the Sacrifice of the  
Masse.*

Touching the prophecie of Malachie, it doth in conclusion importe as much as the figure of Melchisedech, if the circumstances be wel weighed and considered. This Prophet inspired with the holy Ghoste foresaw, that the sacrifices of the Iewes, which were grosse, and in sundry respects vncleane, yer for a time allowable, should cease  
*Malach. 1.* and haue an ende. And that in stede of them, God would be honoured with a pure and cleane Sacrifice, which should be offered vnto his name not only in Iewrie, but also among the Gentiles, from the rising to the going downe of the sunne. This is the effecte of that Prophecie.

Now

Now, if we serch neuer so exactly, and seeke for that Sacrifice, which was not vsed in the olde Lawe, but succeeded in the roome of al them of the olde Law, and hath ben frequented thorough out al nations: what other can we finde, but the Sacrifice of the body and bloud of Christe? In this Sacrifice we perceiue most clearly al the conditions of that Prophecie fulfilled. First, it is in stede of many. Next, it is offered vnto Gods most holy name. Thirdly, it is celebrated and solemnized among the Gentiles, and thereby Gods name is magnified. Fourthly, it is a most pure and syncere Sacrifice, bicause the thing that is offered, is the immaculate Lambe of God, the body and bloud of him, that was conceived of the holy Ghost, borne of the pure virgin, *who neuer committed synne, nor was any guyle founde in his mouth*: Fifthly, it is offered through out al the worlde from East to West. Sixthly, it had beginning in the newe Testament, and was not vsed in the olde Testament, but only by figures foresignified. Sure it is, that none can be named beside this, in which al these conditions by the Prophete specified be accomplished.

Al the  
conditiōs  
of Mala-  
chies pro-  
phetic  
founde in  
the Sacri-  
fice of the  
Aulter.  
1, Pet. 2.

As for the Sacrifice of Christes body vpō the Crosse, it was offered in one special place, in Golgoltha without the gates of Ierusalem. The sacrifices of thanks geuing, of praise, of almose dedes, of mercie, of a contrite harte, of preaching Gods wordes, these and such like, succeeded not in the roome of al the olde sacrifices, nor beganne they in the newe Testament, but were vsed in the tyme of the Law, as wel as they be now in these daies, as they which be common to bothe Testamentes.

Sacrifices  
common  
to both  
testa-  
ments.

That this Sacrifice of the body and bloud of Christe

That this  
Sacrifice



Diuis. 3.

succeded  
al the Sa-  
crifices of  
the olde  
Lawe.

*A Reioindre to M. Iewels Replie*

August. de  
ciuita. lib.  
17. ca. 20.

Eccles. 3.

succeded al the Sacrifices of the olde Law, which of the Fathers in their learned treatises haue not reported? It is needelesse to reherse many testimonies. The witnesse of S. Augustine alone for the plainenesse and auctoritie of it, might suffice. He writeth thus. *Vbi ait (Ecclesiastes) non est bonum homini, nisi quod manducabit & bibet, quid credibilius dicere intelligitur, quam quod ad participationem mensæ huius pertinet, quam sacerdos ipse mediator Testamenti noni exhibet secundum ordinem Melchisedech, de corpore & sanguine suo? Id enim Sacrificium successit omnibus illis Sacrificijs veteris Testamenti, quæ immolabantur in umbra futuri. Propter quod etiâ vocẽ illam in Psalmo tricesimo nono eiusdem mediatoris per Prophetiam loquentis agnoscimus. Sacrificium & oblationem noluisti, corpus autem perfecisti mihi, quia pro illis omnibus sacrificijs & oblationibus corpus eius offertur, & participantibus ministratur. Whereas Salomon saith, a man hath no good thing, but that he shal eat and drinke, what thing is more credible that he vnderstandeth in so saying, then that appertaineth vnto the partaking of this table, which the Priest him selfe the mediator of the newe Testament doth exhibit according to the order of Melchisedech, of his owne body and bloude? For that Sacrifice hath succeeded al those sacrifices of the olde Testament, which were sacrificed in shadow of that which was to come. For whiche cause we doo acknowledge that same voice of the selfe same Mediatour speaking by prophecie in the nyne and thirteth Psalme, *Sacrifice and Oblation thou refusedst, but a body thou madest persue for me*, bicause for al those sacrifices and oblations his body is offered, and ministred vnto the partakers.*

The

The last cause of this testimonie declareth plainly, that S. Augustine meant not the bloudy Sacrifice made vpon the Crosse, but the vnbloudy Sacrifice offered by the Priestes in remembraunce of the same, as the which is not only offered vp, but also ministred vnto the partakers.

If this notwithstanding any yet remaine in doubt, whether the Prophecie of Malachie be to be vnderstanded of this vnbloudy Sacrifice, it may please him to heare other olde learned Fathers teaching the same doctrine. S. Chrysostome writing vpon the .95. Psalme, alleging this very Prophecie: *In omni loco Sacrificium offeretur nomini meo, & Sacrificium purum*: In euery place a Sacrifice shalbe offered vnto my name; and that a pure Sacrifice: saith forthwith: *Vide quam luculenter, quamque dilucide mysticam interpretatus est mensam, quae est incuruenta hostia*. See how plainly, and how clearly he hath declared the mystical Table, which is the vnbloudy Sacrifice.

Chrysost.  
in Psalm.  
95.

Malac. 1.

S. Irenaeus likewise writing against Valentinus the Heretike, S. Augustine, also, and S. Iustinus the martyr, do expounde the prophecie for the same Sacrifice. Whose sayings here to reherse, to the proufe of so certaine a doctrine, it were more tedious, then needeful.

Irene. lib.  
4. ca. 32.  
Aug. citra.  
Aduersar.  
leg. et pro-  
phet. lib. 1.  
cap. 20.  
Iustinus in  
Dialog. ad  
Tryphonē.

Wherefore this being so sufficiently witnessed by the Auncient Doctours of the Church (against whose auctoritie no noueltie is to be heard) as a most vndoubted truth, that the sacrifice, which Christe made of his body and bloude at his last supper, is that pure and Vnbloudy Sacrifice, whiche Malachie prophesied should be offered vp vnto God from the East to the

to the west: this also being no lesse true, that Christe appointed and auctorized some to offer the same (otherwise to what purpose was it instituted?) and sith that we reade of none other appointed and auctorized thereto, but the Apostles, and their successours, Priestes of the newe Testament, nor haue we heard of any that lawfully euer tooke vpon them to offer the same, that were not Priestes: with what impudencie is it denyed, that the Apostles had, and Priestes now haue, auctoritie to offer vp this pure Sacrifice of the body and bloud of Christe vnto his Father?

Thus thou maist perceiue good reader, the argument, which M. Iewel here ascribeth vnto me, and would to seeme ridiculous, to conclude rightly for the truth, if the due consideration of the circumstances be not omitted. Withal thou vnderstandest, that who so euer allegeth the figure of Melchisedech, and the Prophecie of Malachie to prooue, that the Priestes of the new Testament haue auctoritie and power to offer vp Christe vnto his Father, he maketh no euil choise of the stoare of authorities, by witnesse of which that point is prooued and confirmed.

As for the mater of greeuance M. Iewel, whereof you complaine so greeuously, which is, that I charge them of your syde, with wresting by ouerthwart and false interpretation the wordes of the Institution of this Sacrifice, the figure of Melchisedech, and the Prophecie of Malachie: I vttered it vpon very iust occasion, as the learned do knowe. The same ought to be greuous in dede vnto you, not bicause ye are tolde of it by me, but bicause it is true. Neither thought I it good: to exemplifie the

hie the mater, staying the course of my brieft Answer to your Challenge, by descending vnto the particulars: for that my scope and chiefe intent was, not to confute the contrary Doctrine, but to prooue and establish the truth of this Article by you most wickedly denied.

If it be pleasure vnto you to beholde particular places and pointes of your false Legierdemaine disclosed, by reading ouer my Confutatio of your lying Apologie, my Reioindre to your Replie, that also which M. D. Sander, D. Heskins, M. Rastel, M. Dorman, and M. Stapleton haue written against you: your luste may happely be satisfied. Take your fyl of that, vntil more come.

*Jewel.*

Perhappes he wil say, Yee expounde the Prophecie of Malachie, sometimes of Praier, and sometimes of the Preachinge of the Gospel. This was neuer the Prophetes meaninge: this is an horrible vvreasting of the Scriptures. Thus, no doubt, M. Harding wil say: for otherwise he can say nothinge. And yet he knowveth, and, beinge learned, can not choose but knowv, that this is the Olde learned Catholique Fathers Exposition, touching these woordes of the Prophete Malachie, and not ours. He knowveth, that the Ancient Father Tertullian saith thus, The pure Sacrifice, that Malachias speaketh of, that should be offered vp in euery place, Est Prædicatio Euangelij vsque ad finem Mundi: Is the Preachinge of the Gospel vntil the ende of the worlde: And in another place, Simplex Oratio de Conscientia pura: The Sacrifice, that Malachie meante, is a deuoute Praier proceedinge from a pure Conscience. He knowveth, that S. Hierome expoundeth the same woordes in this wise: Dicit, Orationes Sanctorum Domino offerendas esse, non in vna Orbis Prouincia Iudæa, sed in omni loco: The Prophete Malachie meaneth hereby, That the Praiers of Holy people should be offered vnto God, not onely in Iewrie,

Tertull.  
contra  
Iudeos.  
Tertull.  
contra  
Marcion.  
lib. 4.  
Hieron. in  
1. Caput  
Malach.

Euseb. De  
Demonst.  
li. 1. To  
si. 86.  
X<sup>o</sup>u ou  
mixmu.

that was one prouince of the worlde, but also in al places. He knowveth, that Eusebius calleth the same Sacrifice of Malachie, The Sacrifice, and the Incense of Praier. Thus the Holie Catholique Fathers expounded these vwoordes of the Prophete Malachie: and yet were they not therefore iudged either onerthvarte wreasters of the Scriptures, or horrible deceimers of the people.

Now, of the other side, if it may please M. Harding to shew forth but one Anciēt Doctour, or Father, that either by the Exāple of Melchisedech, or by force of these vwoordes of Malachie, vvil conclude, that the Priest hath Authoritie, and Power, to offer up Verelie, and in dede, the Sonne of God vnto his Father, he may happily vvinne some credit.

Harding.

In defence of your felowes, and of your selfe, you say, that wheras ye expound the prophēcie of Malachie sometimes of Praier, and sometimes of the preaching of the Ghospel, therin ye vse no wreasting of the Scripture, nor fallshod: bicause the old lerned Catholike Fathers haue so expounded the place. And here you name Tertullian, S. Hierome, and Eusebius.

That the Preaching of the Gospel may be, and is called a Sacrifice, I denie not. Mary that by th'authoritie, which here you pretend to allege out of Tertullia it is proued, and that by the same the meaning of Malachies prophēcie is to be drawn quit frō the Sacrifice of th'Aulter: this I deny vtterly. And how farre your dealig in these weighty maters cōcerning the faith of a Christē man is to be trusted, by this to al it may appere.

M. Iewvel  
forgeth a  
saiyng of  
his ovvne  
ad putteth  
it vpon  
Tertullian

First, wheras you beare al men in hand, that I know, that the Ancient Father Tertullian faith, as here you reporte: it is very false. for how can I know the thing, that is not at al? Tertullian faith not so. These wordes, *The pure Sacrifice, that Malachias speaketh of, that should be offered up in euery place, est Prædicatio Euangelij vsq. ad finē mundi*, be

not



not to be found in al Tertullians booke *Cōtra Iudeos*. Yet you haue put them in a distinct letter, in which the say-inges of the Doctors be printed, that your Reader should beleue, they were the wordes of Tertullia. This is a forgerie wrought in your owne shoppe, fathered vpon Tertullian. Phy M. Iewel, can neither shame, nor the feare of God, withdraw you from vsing such forged sayinges of your owne, with which being by you fathered vpon som Ancient Doctor of the Church, your common manner is to face out an vntrue mater, as crafty players at Cardes doo as they say, with a Cârde of ten?

Nexte, you swarue very much from the meaning and purpose of Tertullian. For he saith not, that the Preaching of the Ghospel is that cleane Sacrifice, which Malachie prophced of, but farre otherwise. Tertullian hauing spoken of the two kindes of Sacrifices of the two peoples, the Iewes and the Gentiles, foreshewed at the beginning in th' oblations of Cain, and Abel: demaunderth, whereas Gods law geuen by Moyses required the carnal sacrifices to be made by the people of Israel in the land of promise, and nowher els: why the holy Ghost afterward not withstanding by Malachie, and also by Dauid fortelleth, that the Iewes earthly and fleshly sacrifices should ceasse, and that spiritual Sacrifices should be offered vp to God ouer the whole world. Vnto this question he answereth him selfe, and saith. *Indubitatè, quòd in omni terra exire habebat prædicatio Apostolorū*, that is to say, *Vndoubtedly, because the preaching of th' Apostles was to come forth ouer al the world.*

This assuredly is the true abbrigement and meaning of Tertullians woordes there. And cleare it is, he saith not, that the Preaching of the Ghospell is the pure

*Genes. 4.*

*Psal. 95.*

*Tertullia.  
contra Iu-  
daos.*

*tertullias  
place trus  
ly declag  
reda*

Sacrifice, that Malachie speaketh of, as you vntruly reporte of him : but onely that the holy Ghoſte foreſignified by Malachie, and by Dauid, that the Iewes ſacrifices being aboliſhed, pure ſacrifices ſhould be offered among al Nations of the earth, bicauſe it ſhould come to paſſe, that the Apoſtles ſhould preach ouer the whole worlde. So that by Tertullians verditte, the preaching of the Goſpel was not that pure Sacrifice it ſelfe ſpoken of by Malachie, but the Apoſtles preaching that then was to come, was the cauſe, why Malachie and Dauid enſpired of the holy Ghoſte, ſortolde the ceaſſing of the Iewes carnal ſacrifices, and the ſetting vp, or uſe of the Gentiles ſpiritual Sacrifices. More then this, which is nothing at al, Tertullia in that place maketh not for you.

Leaue, leaue M. Iewel for your credites ſake (if nothing els can moue you) to deceiue vnlearned ſoules, whom Chriſte hath ſo derely bought, with ſayings of your owne forging, fathering them vpon the auncient Doctours. It is a manifeſt token what litle good ſtuſſe ye haue to defend your new ghospel withal, whereas ye ſet forth your owne pelfe vnder the name of the auncient writer Tertullian. Wherein ye ſollow falſe Lapidaries and Goldſmithes, who ſel Criſtal and glaſſe, for true pretious ſtoanes, and gilted copper, for pure golde.

Your other three places, which you pretend to allege out of Tertullian, S. Hierome, and Eusebius, be not with ſuch forme of wordes by thoſe Fathers ſet forth, as you here reporte them. The ſleight of falſifying that you ſo cōmonly uſe, in this place for your purpoſe maketh but only a colourable ſhew to the ignorāt, who beleue what ſo euer you ſay : to the learned, who by diligent examination

tion wil ferch what you say, a substantial proufe in dede, it maketh not. Al be it I graunt, wheras the Prophecie of Malachie speaketh of two thinges, *thymiana*, incense, and *Oblatio munda*, the cleane Oblation or Sacrifice: that the best learned Fathers haue expounded the *Incense*, of Prayer, and the *cleane Oblation*, of the Sacrifice of the Aulter, that is now offered in the Church, through the whole worlde.

Where Tertullian disputing with Marcion the heretike expoundeth it of Prayer, either it is his priuate sense, which bringeth no preiudice vnto the doctrine of the Catholike Church: or he meaneth it as the other Fathers doo, of the Sacrifice of the Aulter, which is consecrate with prayer. For so the olde learned Fathers cal the wordes of Consecration. Els if it should be expounded of al manner of prayer, or of prayer in general, as it is made of ech priuate man: it can not alwaies seme to be the cleane Sacrifice prophecied of by Malachie, bicause the same is made by those that be not altogether pure, and without spot of sinne. For so the Scripture witnesseth: *Who can say, my hart is cleane, I am cleane frō sinne?*

But the Prayer, wherewith the Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe is consecrate, being the wordes of our Lorde, *Who neuer did synne, nor was guile found in his mouth*: is both in that respect pure and cleane, and also for that it is pronounced by the Priest, as the public minister of the Church, whose priuate vncleannes what so euer it be, in that behalfe impaireth not the worthinesse of the sacrifice, nor of the prayer, wherewith it is consecrate. Who also at what time he offered that Sacrifice, ought specially to be of a pure conscience.

Contra  
Marcionē  
lib. 4.

V What  
Tertullian  
meant by  
pure prayer.

Prouer-  
bi. 10.

1. Pet. 2.  
Esa. 53.

Tertullia.  
aduersus  
Marcion.  
lib. 4.

And therefore Tertullian hauing reherſed the woordes of Malachie (though ſome what otherwiſe then either the ſeuenty Interpretours, or the Hebrue bookes haue, and otherwiſe then he him ſelfe reherſed them writing againſt the Iewes) *in every place ſhalbe offered vp in my name ſacrifice, and the cleane Sacrifice*: might wel adde further by way of expoſition, *ſcilicet, ſimplex oratio de conſcientia pura*, to wit ſimple (or pure) prayer from a cleane conſcience. In which prophecie the prophete fortelleth, that God hath diſpoſed a better Sacrifice to be offered vp vnto his name, then the ſacrifices were, which the Iewes offered.

Simple  
Prayer.

By *ſimple prayer*, he meaneth ſuch, as is not tempered and mingled with any ſinneſul infection of humane affections, of which ſorte is the prayer of cōſecration of this Sacrifice, as that which is the worde of our Lorde, and not the worde of man. Whoſe prayer, as al other his actions, proceeding out of his corrupte harte, is ſteined with ſome ſpote of ſynne, wereunto oure nature corrupted in Adam is thral and ſubiecte.

*The wordes of Conſecration of the Sacrament,  
called by the name of prayer.*

Iuſtinus  
martyr in  
2. Apolog.

If to any it ſeme ſtrange, the wordes, wherewith the body and bloude of Chriſte are conſecrate, to be called a prayer: by reading the olde learned Fathers he ſhal finde it ſo termed in ſundry places. S. Iuſtine the Martyr ſpeaking of the bleſſed Sacrament, nameth it τὴν δι' ὧν χῆς λόγου το παρ' αὐτοῦ ὁ χρεῖς καθέσται τροφήν, the foode which is made the Eucharist through the prayer of the worde that we haue of him, he meaneth Chriſte. Loe he calleth the conſecration, the Prayer of the worde, that Chriſte

Christ deliuered vnto his Apostles, and consequently to their successours, Priestes of the new Testament.

S. Augustine writing vnto Paulinus, saith, *Precationes accipimus dictas, quas facimus in celebratione Sacramentorum, antequam illud quod est in Domini mensa, incipiat benedici: Orationes, cum benedicatur & sanctificatur, & ad distribuendum cōminuitur.* We take *Precatiōes* to be called those praier, which we make in the celebratiō of the sacramentes, before that, which is on our Lordes table, beginne to be blessed: and *Oratiōes* (we take for the praier that be said) when that (which is on our Lordes table) is blessed and sanctified, or consecrated, and broken to be distributed.

Augustin.  
ad Pauli-  
num. Epi-  
stol. 59.

Againe he saith there, *excepto nomine generali orationis, ea propriè intelligenda est Oratio, quā facimus ad votum, id est, πρὸς ὅλῃν.* *Vonentur autē omnia qua offeruntur Deo, maxime sancti Altaris Oblatio, &c.* Beside the general name of Praier, that properly is to be vnderstāded praier, which we make at vowe. And al thinges are vowed, which be offred vnto God, chiefly the Oblatiō of the holy Aulter. Sith then that is properly a praier, which is made at vow, that is to say, when we vow ought vnto God, and what thinges so euer we offer vnto God, the same be vowed, that is to wit, by the seruice of our harte, be geuē, dedicated, and rendred vnto God, thereby to protest our faith in him, to thanke him, to praise him, to honour him, to shewe ourselues myndeful of his benefites, among al thinges the Oblation of the Aulter being that which is chiefly vowed: it foloweth that the Consecration is specially to be called and accompred prayer.

S. Hierome likewise called the wordes of Consecration by the name of Praier, where he saith in his Epistle to

Hierony.  
ad Eua-  
grium.



ble to Euagrius. *Quid patitur mensarum minister, ut super eos se tumidus offerat, ad quorum preces Christi corpus sanguisque conficitur?* What aileth the minister of tables, (wherby he meaneth a Deacon) to swel and aduance him selfe ouer them (he speaketh there of Priestes) at whose Prayers, the body and bloude of Christe is consecrated?

Augustin.  
Confess. li-  
bro 9. cap.  
12.

What shal I neede to allege mo Fathers for proufe of a thing so wel known to them, that be conuersant in their bookes? Wherefore seing the worde of Consecration is the woorde of prayer, whereby the body and bloude of Christe, *the Sacrifice of our Raunson*, as S. Augustine calleth it, is by vs offered vp and vowed vnto God, that a remembrance of his death be celebrated of our parte, and that mercie be extended vnto vs of Gods parte, for that bodies sake represented and offered vp which hath dyed for vs: and seing in the same we our selues are also offered vp, dedicated, vowed, and rendred vnto God, bicause therein Christe our head, whereof we be members, is offered: the worde of Consecration in this consideration being most properly ond truly a prayer, yea (if I may so terme it) an actual prayer, bicause it is such a woorde, as fulfilleth the acte of the Sacrifice: it standeth with good reason and learning, that Tertullian expounding the cleane Sacrifice wherof Malachie speaketh of prayer, be vnderstanded to meane the oblation and Sacrifice of the Aulter, as being that, which is the highest kinde of prayer, and of worshipping God, that can be.

Thus that you bring out of Tertullia, maketh nothing for excuse of them of your side, whom I noted for wresting the place of Malachie, for that by their ouerthwart and

and false interpretations, they racke it from the meaning of the Sacrifice of the Aulter, offered vp vnto God in the new Testament in al places among the Gentiles, by Priestes after the order of Melchisedek, vnder Christe.

**T**ouching the two other Doctours, S. Hierome, and Eusebius, whom you allege for you, as expounding this place of Malachie of praier (whereby, though they so did, you see the Sacrifice of the Aulter is not excluded): let vs see whether in them you haue vsed a more truth and fidelitie, then you haue in Tertullian. Verily were you myne Aduersarie neuer so much, yet for truthe sake I can not but geue you this commendation: You shewe your selfe alwaies in your writing one manner a man, which is a token of great constancie. I meane, that lightly you neuer recite any Doctour, but you falsifie him, and corrupte his meaning, by clipping away of parte, or by changing of woordes, or by adding of your owne, or by keeping close some what that goeth before, or commeth after, or by conceeling the circumstances of the places alleged by one way or other. *He knoweth (say you meaning of me) that Saint Hierome expoundeth the same woordes in this wise. Dicit, orationes sanctorum Domino offerendas esse, non in una orbis prouincia Iudaa, sed in omni loco: The Prophete Malachie meaneth hereby (so you interpret) that the praier of holy people should be offered vnto God, not onely in Iewrie, that was but one prouince of the worlde, but also in al places.*

The practise of falsifiers.

For the right vnderstanding of this point, I pray thee

P

Reader

M. Iewell  
falsifieth  
S. Hiero-  
rome.

Reader peruse the place of S. Hierome thy selfe, beleue thine owne eyes, beleue not such false jugglers. Which counsel I aduise thee to obserue not onely for trial of this one place, but also for trial of other places, which M. Iewel bringeth in defence of any his negatiue Articles. Verily neither hath S. Hierom these very wordes in such order, as they be here laid forth, and the whole sentence vewed and considered together, maketh directly for the Catholike doctrine which I defend, and quite against that M. Iewel saith. To thintent I be plainer, though longer, here I wil reherse the whole place, as we finde it written in S. Hierome. Thus he saith.

Hieron. in  
Commen.  
in Malac.  
cap. 1.

*Proprie nunc ad Sacerdotes Iudaorum sermo fit Domini, qui offerunt cæcum & claudum, & languidum ad immolandum: ut sciant carnalibus victimis spirituales victimas succeduras. Et nequaquam taurorum hircorumq; sanguinem, sed thymiama, hoc est, Sanctorum Orationes Domino offerendas: & non in una orbis prouincia Iudea, nec in una Iudea urbe Hierusalē, sed in omni loco offerri oblationem, nequaquā immundā, ut à populo Israel, sed mundā, ut in Ceremoniis Christianorum. Ab ortu enim solis vsq; ad occasum magnum est nomen Domini in gentibus, &c.* The worde of our Lord is nowe properly vttered vnto the Priestes of the Iewes, who do offer that which is blind, lame, and sickely, to be sacrificed, to thintent they might know, that spiritual sacrifices should succede their carnal Sacrifices: And that the bloude of bulles, and goates should no more be offered vnto our Lorde, but Incense, that is to say, the Prayers of Holy men: and that not in Iewrie only, which is but one prouince of the world, nor in Ierusalem only, which is but one Citie of Iewrie, but in euery place there is offered

fered an Oblation, not an vncleane one, as was offered of the people of Israel, but a cleane one, as is offered vp in the Ceremonies of the Christians. For from the rising of the sunne to the setting, the name of our Lorde is great among the Gentiles.

This Prophet speaketh of two things, the one don among the Iewes, and now to be leaste of, the other to be done among the Gentils. Of ech he hath a double consideration. Concerning the first, which is the sacrifice of brute beastes, that it was done but in one prouince of the worlde, in Iewrie, and only in Hierusalem, a Citie of that Prouince. Againe, that the same thing was vncleane and filthy. For how filthy a thing the bloude of Bulles, goates, rammes, and other beastes, the smoke and sauour of their grese burnt in Sacrifice, was: it is sone conceiued. Concerning the second, which is Sacrifice to be done among the Gentiles, the consideration thereof is also double, for that it is pure and cleane, and also for that it is frequented in euery place.

This Sacrifice is of two sortes, the one mere spiritual and internal: the other external as touching the Ceremonie of doing it, spiritual also notwithstanding. The one, after the maner of the Prophetes, who be wont to expresse thinges of the new Testament, with wordes of the olde Testament, he calleth *Incense*, and S. Hierome expoundeth it of praier, which ascendeth fro our hartes vnto the heavenly throne of mercie like a swete perfume of Incense. And so S. Iohn in his reuelation, as S. Irenæus writeth, calleth the swete perfumes, the prayers of Sainctes.

The other he termeth a *pure Oblation*, the which S. Hierom expouñdeth of that pure Oblation, which is offered

Two  
thinges  
spoken of  
by Malas  
chie.

Prayer  
signified  
by Incense.

Apoc. 5.  
Lib. 4. ca.  
33. Augu-  
contra ad-  
uersar. le-  
gis et Pro-  
phetarum

lib. 1. c. 20



Four  
conditiōs  
of the  
Mystical  
Oblatiō.

euery where, *in the Ceremonies of the Christians.* Which can be vnderstanded of none other, but of the Sacrifice of the Body and Bloude of Christe offered vp vnto God by Priestes of the newe Testament. For what other Oblation or sacrifice can be named, that hath these foure conditions, which S. Hierome here toucheth, but the Oblation of the Aulter? The conditions be these. That it succede the Sacrifices of the olde Law, that it be pure and cleane, that it be made in al places, and that it be celebrated and solemnized in the Ceremonies of the Christians.

In his  
booke  
Against  
the B. of  
VVin-  
chester. li.  
3. fol 425.  
& 443.

Of what so euer spiritual and internal Sacrifice the Gospellers wil vnderstand this place, be it laude and praise, thanks geuing, prayer, a contrite harte, mercie, or any suche other, as Cranmare vnderstandeth it of laude, praise and thanks, and M. Iewel of prayer: it shal quite be auoided by one or other of these conditions, specially by the first, and the fourth. For how can laude and praise, or praier, or any other mere spiritual sacrifice vsed in the newe Testament, seme to succede the Sacrifices of the olde Testament, seing al suche spiritual Sacrifices be cōmon to both Testaments, and that thing can not be said to succede, that had place before?

Against  
the B. of  
VVins-  
ter. lib.  
3. fol. 99.

And if our Aduersaries wil cauil neuer so much, expounding the pure Oblation that Malachie speaketh of, of some other thinge, as Cranmare in one place expoundeth it in general of al the workes that Christian people doo to the glorie of God: the same shal be auoided by that it is restrained vnto that Oblation, which is made (as S. Hierom declareth) *in Ceremonijs Christianorū*, in the Ceremonies of the Christians. For al these spiritual  
and



and internal sacrifices be done inwardly in the harte of man: and what other workes can they name done to the glorie of God in the publike Ceremonies of the Christians, which the prophete may reasonably seme to haue meant? And what meaneth S. Hierome by the Ceremonies of the Christians, but the Ceremonies of the Church vsed through al the worlde in the celebration and solemnitie of the Masse, wherein the Sacrifice of the Body and bloud of Christ is made and offered by the Priestes, touching ministerie, by the faithful people also, touching vowe? Which Ceremonies be the chiefe, the most auncient, the most reuerent, the most mystical, and most holy Ceremonies, that Christians haue.

Ceremonies of the Christians.

Wherefore, whereas Malachie, and likewise S. Hierome expounding his wordes, speake of two thinges, of prayer, and of the pure Oblatio, the same being that Oblation which is offred euery where from the East to the west in the Ceremonies of the Christians by his interpretation: now it appeareth how falsly M. Iuel demeaneth him selfe in this point, who maketh S. Hierome so to vnderstand the place of Praier, as though he vnderstode the whole saying of Prayer only, and not one parte of it of Prayer, and an other parte also of the Sacrifice of the Church, whereas in deede he vnderstandeth it of both, and most expressely speaketh of both, as I haue now declared. Thus he neuer leaueth to iustle away one truth, with an other truth.

**N**OW to come to Eusebius, let vs see, whether you entreate him with more truth, then you haue entreated Tertullian, and S. Hierom. *He knoweth* (say

P iij you

you likewise of me) that Eusebius calleth the same sacrifice of Malachie, the sacrifice and the Incense of prayer. And for some shewe of proufe for that you say, you put in the margin of your booke, this peece of a Greke sen-

*Euseb. De* tēce out of Eusebius, Τὸ δὲ θυμὸν θυμίσμας, as much to say,  
*Demonst.* the incense, or perfume that is made through prayers.  
*lib. 1.*

For answer here vnto, It is to be remembred, as I said before, that Malachie speaketh of two thinges to be of-

*Incense,* Incense, and the pure Sacrifice. Eusebius, where he alle-  
*Pure Sa-* geth this place of Malachie, to proue that Moses Lawe  
*cristice.* is ended, and that the new Lawe of the new Testament is come in place: by Incense vnderstandeth Prayer, as S.

*M. Iewell* Hierome, and other olde learned Fathers, doo. As for  
*falsifieth* the Pure Sacrifice, whereof now we speake, that he cal-  
*Eusebius.* leth it the Sacrifice, and the Incense of Prayer, it is vtter-ly false. In that very place which you allege, Eusebius doth so expounde Malachie, as to any man of iudgement it shal euidently appeare, how vntruly you reporte of him, and how aptly he maketh for the catholike doctrine, and against you.

*Euseb. De* The beginning of the sentence is this. Τὸ γὰρ ὡς παντὶ  
*Demonst.* τόπῳ θυμίσμας καὶ θυρίαν ἀναφίστασαι θεῷ, τίς ἐτερον παρίσταν  
*lib. 1.* ἡ ὁτι &c. In English the whole truely turned worde for worde, soundeth thus. That in euery place Incense, and Sacrifice is offred vp vnto God, what other thing doth it signifie, then that the time shal come, when they shal offer vp vnto God that is aboue al, the Incense which is made by Prayers, and that which is called the Pure Sacrifice, that is made not by bloude, but by Godly actions, not in Ierusalem, neither in this or that determinate place, but in euery countrie,

countre, and in al nations. Beholde Reader how he expoundeth the Incense or perfume, whereof Malachie speaketh, of the Incense that is made by Prayer, as afterward in the ende of that first booke to that meaning he allegeth the wordes of the Psalme, *Dirigatur Oratio mea sicut incensum in conspectu tuo Domine*: Let my Prayer ô Lorde like a perfume be brought vp into thy sight. P (al. 140.

Touching the Pure Sacrifice, which is offred vp vnto God by pure and godly actions, that thereby he vnderstandeth most specially the External Sacrifice of the Church, which is offred vpon an Altar, the wordes following do manifestly declare. For immediatly to shew what he vnderstode by the Pure Sacrifice, he bringeth forth a prophecie of Esay foreshewing the same. *There shal be an Altar* (saith the Prophet Esay as Eusebius reciteth) *to our Lorde in the countre of Egypte, and our Lord shal be known vnto the Egyptiâs, and (God) shal send them a man who shal saue them: and the Egyptians shal know our Lorde in that day, and they shal offer vp sacrifices, and make vnto our Lord, and shal performe the same, and they shal be conuerted vnto our Lorde, and he shal heare them, and heale them.* E (ai. 19.

For the better vnderstanding of this place, by the Egyptians Esay meaneth, as Eusebius there afterward expou-  
deth, al kind of mē, that before the cōming of Christ were Idolatours, as the Egyptians were. Now if Eusebius had vnderstāded the Pure Sacrifice mētioned by Malachie of prayer, or only of mere spiritual and internal sacrifices, he wold not haue alleged for further prouf and declaratiō of it, that place of Esay, wher he maketh expres mentiō of an Altar to be set vp among the Egyptiâs, that is, amōg al  
the

the Gentiles, who were before geuen to Idolatrie . The external Aulter argueth and presupposeth an external sacrifice. For els if the Sacrifice be inward onely and spiritual, to the doing of it, the building of an Aulter is void and to no purpose.

If M. Iewel to auoide the force of this place alleged by Eusebius, wil bring phraſes, as his manner is, whereby to declare , that Aulterſ oftentimes be vnderſtanded to be ſpiritual (which I acknowledge and confeſſe that the Aulterſ of our hartes be of the Fathers not ſeldom ſpoken of ) and therfore wil ſay, that Eusebius vnderſtode this prophecie of Eſay of ſuch a ſpiritual Aulter : to this I anſwer: Eusebius vnderſtandeth Eſay to meane ſuch an Aulter, as Moſes lawe forbad any where els to be ſet vp, then in Iewrie, and that only in one citie of Iewrie . But it was neuer forbidden by Moſes Lawe, but that the ſpiritual Aulterſ of mēes hartes might be prepared in moe places then in one onely Citie of Iewrie , for Ieremie, Ezechiel, Daniel, Ezdras, Tobias , and many other holy Iewes, and Iſraelites had ſuch ſpiritual Aulterſ, and theron offered acceptable ſpiritual ſacrifices vnto God in other Countries beſides Iewrie, and in Cities farre diſtāt from Ieruſalem: wherefore he meant of ſuch Aulterſ , as Chriſtians haue euer had in their Churches , which be made after the manner of the Aulter appointed by Moſes, though the Sacrifice be of a farre diuers manner.

Viſible,  
and ex-  
ternal  
Aulter,

Eusebius wordes be theſe, *ὁ μὲν δὲ Μωϋσῆς θυσιαστήριον etc.* *Moſes ordeined Aulter and ſacrifices to be made in no Land els where, but in Iewrie only, and that in one only, Citie thereof.* But this prophecie of Eſay ſaith, *that an Aulter ſhal be ſet vp vnto our Lorde in the Land of Egypte , and that the*  
Egy-

*Egyptians them selues shal offer vp the Sacrifices vnto the Lorde of the Prophetes, and no lenger vnto their Countrie Goddesses.*

After that he hath spoken what he thought good of this new manner of Aulter, and Sacrifice, of the translation of the Aulter, and priestthod appointed by Moses, and therefore consequently of the translation of the Law it selfe: in conclusion thus he saith. ὅρα δὲ ὅν καὶ νῦν καινῆς νομοθεσίας δὲ ἐν ἧς τὴν πρὶν δηλουμένων σύσασιν. As much to say, *Now then is the time come, that there is neede of a new lawe to be made, that the foresaid thinges may take place.* But as for the spiritual Aulter of mennes hartes, and the mere spiritual and inward sacrifices, as the sacrifices of prayer, of laude and praise, of thanks geuing, and such other: who vnderstandeth not, that they might wel take place, and be frequented without necessitie of any newe Lawe to be made, and that other wheres, then onely in one Citie of Iewrie? Verely the vse of such Aulters requireth not a change of Moses lawe, and priestthode. For such Aulters, and such sacrifices were in Egypte, and Chaldaea, among many thousandes of Iewes, who lyued in those Landes, long before Moses law was dissolued. The Aulter therfor and Sacrifice that Eusebius meaneth in that place for declaration of Malachies Prophecie, is the Aulter and Sacrifice, wherevpon and which, the faithful people by ministerie of Priestes of the new Testamēt, doth continually offer vnto God, to wit the body and bloude of Christ, in remembrance of his death, after the new Decrees and ordinances of the new Testament, as he saith in \* one place, after the Decrees and ordinances of the Church, as he saith in an \* other place.

\* Lib. 1.  
De De-  
monstrat.  
κατὰ τοὺς  
ἐκκλησια-  
στικους  
θεσμούς.  
\* Lib. 5.  
De De-  
monstrat.

Q That



Lib. 1. De Demonst. That no man should doubt of what Aulter he meant, thus there he speaketh of it. *To our one onely Lorde an Aulter of vnbloudy and reasonable hostes, after the new mysteries of the new Testament, throughout the whole worlde hath ben erected, both in Egypt it selfe, and in the other nations being of like conditions vnto the Egyptians as touching wicked errour.* Verely these wordes can not with any reason seme to be meant of the spiritual Aulter of our hartes. For though on the same we offer vp vnbloudy and reasonable hostes, yet that is not done after the new Mysteries of the new Testament. For in the olde Testament also no lesse then in the new, such mere spiritual and internal sacrifices were offered vp vpon the spiritual Aulter of good mēnes hartes.

Luc. 22. 1, Cor. 11. And what other be these *new Mysteries of the new Testament*, whereof this doctōr speaketh, but those that Christ taught the Apostles, and deliuered vnto them at his last Supper, where he conuerted bread and wine into his body and bloud, whom, as S. Irenæus saith, *he taught the new Oblation of the new Testament, which the Church receiuing of the Apostles, offereth vp vnto God throughout the whole worlde?*

Whereas then Eusebius expounding the prophecie of Malachie, speaking of Incense, and pure Sacrifice, vnderstandeth it to speake of two distinct sortes of Oblations: therein appeareth either the ignorance, or the wilful malice of M. Iewel, who referreth al to one, that is to say, to Prayer, to thintent the Mystical Oblation and Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christ, be quite excluded. But as the weighing of that which is already alleged out of the mydde of Eusebius first booke. *De Demonstratione Euan-*

*Euangelica*, detecteth M. Iewels fallshod not obscurely: so the due cōsideration of that he writeth vpon the same place of Malachie in the ende of that booke, doth the same most clearly, and putteth away al mystes and clowdes of any obiection to the contrary.

For hauing alleged the prophecie of Malachie to proue the New state of the new Testamēt, in which prophecie God saith, that in euery place, *Incense shal be offered vp vnto his name, and Pure Sacrifice*: to declare what he vnderstādeth by either of them, first he sheweth, what is the Pure Sacrifice that we offer, next, what *Incense* we burne, and what perfume we make.

Concerning *Incense*, he maketh it to be Prayer, and not only Praier, but also other spiritual Sacrifices, namely the sweete fruit of our right opinion touching God, the sacrificing of our selues vnto God, the puritie of our bodies and mindes, the worshipping of God with sincere affection, and with doctrines of truth. *For these* (saith he) *do please him more, then the multitude of sacrifices made with bloud, smoke, and vnsweete saouours.*

VWhat Eusebius vnderstādeth by Incense in Malachie. *Ad finem lib. 1. De Demonst.*

Touching the Pure Sacrifice, he saith, that we sacrifice vnto God the sacrifice of praise. And least he shuld seme to meane none other but the mere spiritual sacrifice, that is declared by wordes, he declareth with very expresse and apt termes, what Sacrifice specially he meant, saying. *θύομεν τὸ ἐνθουσιάζον καὶ σεμνόν καὶ ἱεροπρεπὲς θύμα. θύομεν καὶ ὡς κατὰ τὴν κοινὴν διὰ δὴ κλην τὴν καθαρὰν θυσίαν. 1.* *Sacrificamus Diuinum, & venerandum, & sacrosanctum Sacrificium. Sacrificamus nonē secundū Nouum Testamentum Sacrificium purum.* We sacrifice the Diuine, and the reuerend, and most holy Sacrifice. We sacrifice

Pure Sacrifice.

*Lib. 1. De Demonst. in fine.*

after a new manner according to the new Testament the Pure Sacrifice.

In these wordes Eusebius, doth as it were with pointing of his finger direct vs vnto the most blessed Sacrifice of the Altar: and withal toucheth the manner how it is offered. For what other sacrifice is there in the Church, which is set forth with so special, and so high titles of honour, but the Sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ? For this aboue al other is Diuine, as that wherein Christ, God and man, but as man, vnto God is offered. This chiefly is reuerend and honorable, and most worthily to be accompted holy; wherein is contained, *Sanctum sanctorum*, the holiest of al holy.

As for the manner of sacrificing, what is that we offer vp now in the Church of God, after a new manner, and according vnto the new Testament, but the Sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, which Priestes vnder Christ after the order of Melchisedech offer vp vnto God, vnder the formes of Bread and Wine? This new manner of offering, Christ taught his Apostles, the Apostles deliuered it vnto the Church, to whom, after that he had taken bread into his handes, geuen thanks, broken, and blessed, saying, *this is my body*, and likewise the cuppe, saying also, *this is my bloude*, he gaue that he professed to be his body and bloude, and commaunding them, and in them their successours, to doo the same in remembrance of him, he taught (as S. Irenæus saith) *the new Oblation of the new Testament*.

Luke. 22.

Irenæus.  
lib. 4. ca-  
pit. 32.

Let it be remembred now and considered, how many properties are attributed vnto this Sacrifice, that Malachie speaketh of, partely by the other olde learned

learned Fathers, but specially by S. Hierome, and Eusebius, whom M. Iewel hath brought for him.

First, that it succede al the sacrifices of the olde Lawe:

Hieron. in  
Malachi.  
Cap. 1.

Secondly, that it be offered in euery place:

Thirdly, that it be pure and cleane:

Fourthly, that it be done in the Ceremonies of the Christians:

Fifthly, (to come to Eusebius) that it be Diuine, reuerend, and most Holy:

Euseb. de  
Demonst.  
lib. 1.

Sixthly, that it be offered after a new manner:

Seuenthly, that it be offered according vnto the Mysteries of the new Testament:

Eightly (that I may adde certaine properties out of Eusebius fifth booke *De Demonstratione*) that it be done according vnto the rules, rites, and ordinances of the Church:

Nienthly, that Christe doth performe it after the forme and maner of Melchisedech yet to this day amongest men by his ministers:

Tenthly, that it be such, as was first done by our Lord and Sauour him selfe, and afterward by Priestes that procede from out of him:

εἰς τὴν κλ  
νῦν δὲ ἵα  
τῶν αὐτῶν  
τοῦ θεοῦ  
ραπτῶν  
τῶν.  
\* εἰς αὐτῶν  
τοῦ.

Eleuenthly, that the thinges which be offered contained vnder the formes of bread and wine vsed in this Sacrifice, bee (as Eusebius saith) τὰ ἀληθῆ καὶ ἰκόνων ἀρχέτυπα, that is to say, the very and true thinges, and the principal paternes of the Images: by which worde he meaneth the Sacrifices of Moses Law, which were Images in respect of this truth:

Lib. 1 De  
Demonst.

Twelfthly, that they be the thinges, whereof being then

ἅμα μελ  
λόντων

Diuis. 4.

A Reioindre to M. Iewels Replie

ταῖς τι-  
κόσι πο-  
κεχρημέ-  
νους.

Gen. 14.

Cyprian.

lib. 2. epi-

stol. 3.

then to come, Melchisech long before vsed the Images, as *Eusebius* speaketh, which Images were Breade and Wine, wherewith (as he saith) he blessed Abraham. S. Cyprian calleth this, *veritatem præfiguratae Imaginis*, the truth of the Image, that went before in figure.

Now let M. Iewel name, if he can, what sacrifice is that which we offer vp after a newe manner according vnto the newe Testament, and hath al these conditions and properties. And if he haue none to name besides the blessed Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe, whereof we speake, as we are assured he hath none: then I wish his conscience would ouercome shame, lead him to recant, and consider of the false doctrine, whereby he enuegleth the people of God, making them to beleue, that this Sacrifice is to be vnderstanded only of Prayer, as he him selfe taketh Prayer: and that there is no such external Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe at al. This much I thinke to be yenough for answer vnto his. 3. Diuision.

The . 4 . Diuision .

The Answer.

For, whereas the holy Euangelistes reporte, that Christe at his last Supper tooke Breade, gaue thanks, brake it, and said, This is my body, which is geuen for you: Againe, this is my Bloude, which is shedde for you in remission of sinnes: By these wordes being wordes of Sacrificing and offering, they shewe, and

¶ wordes  
of Obla-  
tio, with-  
out Ter-  
mes of  
Oblatio.



and set forth an Oblatio in Acte, and deede, though the terme it selfe of Oblation, or Sacrifice be not expressed. Albeit to some of excellent knowledge, Datur, here soundeth no lesse, then offertur, or immolatur, that is to say, is offered, or Sacrificed, specially the addition, pro vobis, withal considered. For if Christe said truely (as he is trueth it selfe, and guile was neuer founde in his mouthe) then was his body presently geuen, and for vs. geuen, at the tyme he spake the woordes, that is, at his Supper. For he saide. datur, is geuen, not dabitur, shalbe geuen. And likewise was his Bloud sheadde in remission of sinnes, at the tyme of that Supper: for the text hath funditur, is sheadde. But the geuing of his Body for vs, and the sheadding of his Bloude in remission of sinnes, is an Oblation of the same: Ergo Christe offered his body and bloud at the Supper. And thus datur, signifieth here as much, as offertur.

1. Pet. 2.

Now this beinge true, that our Lorde offered him selfe vnto his Father at his last Supper, hauing geuen comādemēt to his Apostles to do the same, y<sup>e</sup> he there did, whom then he ordeined Priestes of the newe Testament, saying, Doo this in my remēbrance, as Clemēt doth plainly shew Lib. 8. Apostol. Cōstitut. cap. vltimo: the same charge perteing no lesse to the Priestes, that be now the successours of the Apostles in this behalfe, then:

then to the Apostles them selues: it doth right wel appeare, howe so euer M. Iuel asſureth him selfe of the contrary, and what so euer the Diuel hath wrought, and by his Ministers taught against the Sacrifice of the Masse, that Priestes haue auctoritie to offer vp Christe vnto his Father.

Iewel.

Here M. Harding beginneth to scanne his Tenses, to rip vp Syllables, and to hunte for Letters: And in the ende buildeth vp the highest Castle of his Religion vpon a gheasse. I maruel, that so learned a man vvoulde either vse so vnlearned argumentes; or, hauing such stoare of Authorities, as he pretendeth, vvould euer make so simple choise.

He saith, These wordes, Is Geuen, Is Shead, be wordes of Sacrificing, though the Terme it self of Oblation and Sacrifice, be not expressed. Here M. Harding, bifides that he hath imagined a strange Construction of his ovne, that neuer any learned man kneuve before, and so straggleth alone, and svuarueth from all the Olde Fathers, includeth also a repugnance, and Contradiction against him selfe. For, vvhereas vvordes, and termes sound both one thing, the one being mere Englishe, the other borovved of the Latine, M. Harding saith, Christe in the Institution of his Supper, vsed the VVordes of Sacrificing, and yet expressed not the Termes of Sacrificinge. Suche Priuilege these menne haue, vvith shifte of termes to beguile the vvorlde. For if Christe vsed the vvordes of Sacrificing, how can M. Harding say, He vsed not the Termes of Sacrificing? and yf he vsed not the Termes (vvordes, and Termes being one thing) how can he say, He vsed the vvordes?

Harding.

Little regarding what M. Iewel saith in the lying and scoffing entrie, that he maketh vnto his Replie in this  
Diui-

Diuision, I wil first briefly note vnto thee (good Reader) the pointes, wherein the weight of his whole tale standeth. That done, I wil answer to them in such order, as they shalbe proponed.

The chief  
pointes of  
M. Jewels  
Reple in  
the 4. Di-  
uision.

First, he would prooue, that my wordes include a repugnance and contradiction against my selfe.

1.

Secondly, he chargeth me with controlling the Olde common Translation of the Newe Testament.

2.

Thirdly, he would a contradiction to seme to be implied in my doctrine.

3.

Fourthly, he burtheneth me with the corruption and falsifying of S. Clement.

4.

Fifthly and lastly, he auoucheth that Christe by these woordes, *Doo ye this in my remembrance*, made not the Apostles Priestes, nor gaue them, nor their Successours, auctoritie therby to consecrate and offer vp in Sacrifice his Body and Bloude: but that what so euer was by these wordes commaunded to be done, it pertained vnto the whole people, as wel as vnto the Apostles. So he denieth vtterly the singular and external Sacrifice of the Church, confoundeth the order of the Mysteries, and referreth al to eating of bread, and drinking of wine, in remembrance of Christe.

5.

Luc. 22.

These be the pointes he treateth of in this Diuision, whereby his intent and endeuour is, to reprove my Answer vnto his Challenge. But with how substantial and pithy reasons, or authorities he performeth it, when they shalbe examined and disclosed, it wil appeare.

Touching the first, the mater is sone answered. Lyes make no proufe. This is your common grace M. Jewel, for your aduantage in one place, to make me say

M. Jewels  
custome,

R

lesse

lesse then I doo, in another place, more then I doo, in e-  
uery place, other wise then I doo. Why do you here by  
falle abbridging of my wordes, attribure that vnto two  
verbes, *Is geuen*, and, *Is shed*, which I ascribe vnto the  
whole sentence?

In my An  
swer.  
fol. 105. b

Luc. 22.

Lothe I am to fyl vp the paper with repeating  
that I said before: but your impudencie driueth me vnto  
it. Read the place againe. There (as you knowe) I say  
thus. *Whereas the holy Euangelistes reporte, that Christe  
at his last supper tooke Bread, gaue thanks, brake it, and  
said, This is my body, which is geuen for you. Again, this  
is my bloude, which is shed for you in remission of synnes.  
By these wordes, being wordes of sacrificing and offering,  
they shewe and set forth an Oblation in acte and deede,  
though the terme it selfe of Oblation or Sacrifice be not ex-  
pressed.* Use as much pryeng as you can, in these  
wordes where finde you the Contradiction?

M. Jewell  
saith a  
lye. vpon  
his aduer-  
sary, and  
therevpon  
descāeth.

I graunt you, that wordes and termes, sounde both  
one thing. But where said I, *that Christe in the Insti-  
tution of his supper, used the wordes of sacrificing, and  
yet expressed not the termes of sacrificing?* For thus you  
make me to speake, and therevpon you dally at your  
pleasure, and grounding your selfe vpon a lye, you  
seme to conclude absurditie against me, as though I  
had said, *that Christe used the wordes of sacrificing, and yet  
had denied that he used the termes of sacrificing.* Which  
had ben very vaine, and sonde, wordes, and termes, being  
one thing. Now the truth is, I said not the one, ne denied  
not the other. Here one of vs both must needes be found  
a lyer. If it be not you, tel al the worlde for clearing of  
your selfe, and for sauing your Ministerships honestie,  
where

where I say, that *Christ used not the termes of sacrificing.*

The woordes by which the Euangelistes do describe what Christe did at his last supper, doo importe and im-  
plie the signification of sacrificing and offering. Christe  
say they, *toke bread* into his handes, *gave thanks, brake*  
*it, and said, This is my body, whiche is geuen for you.* Againe,  
*This is my bloud, which is shed for you in remission of synnes.*  
Bicause these woordes do report and set forth an oblation  
in acte and deede: therfore I said, and might wel so say,  
they were woordes of sacrificing and offering. Yet in al  
this description, there is not founde this expresse terme,  
*Sacrifice, or Oblation.* I referred me to the Euāgelistes de-  
scription, and you referre al to the woordes of Christe.

If you marke my woordes wel, you shal finde therein  
reported, not only woordes, but also an acte of Christe,  
and by the Euangelistes, who declare the whole, an ob-  
lation shewed and set forth in acte and deede, this very  
terme it selfe of *Oblatio, or Sacrifice*, not expressed; and this  
to be shewed and set forth (whereby I meane the Gospel  
written) not by Christe, but by the Euāgelistes. Againe,  
whereas I said of the woordes of the Gospel, that they  
were woordes of sacrificing and offring, and that the terme  
it selfe *Oblation, or Sacrifice*, was not expressed: to make  
my saying seme more absurde. you falsifie my saying, re-  
porting me, to haue spoken of the termes of sacrificing,  
as though I had acknowledged the woordes of sacrificing,  
and denied the termes of sacrificing.

M. Iewel  
falsifieth  
the vvor-  
des of the  
Answer

But sir, what meane you? Hath the long studie of  
Rhetorique, driuen out of your head the remembrance  
of Logique? Haue you quite forgotten the olde Distin-  
ction of *implicitè*, and *explicitè*, so much tossed in our So-

R ij phismes,



Things  
implied,  
though  
not vtte-  
red in ex-  
presse ter-  
mes.

*Psal. 109.*

phismes, when we were yong Sophisters at Oxforde? Remember you not that a thing may be implied in wordes, albeit the very termes signifying that thing, be not expressed? As for example, where it is written in the Psalme, *Dixit Dominus Domino meo, sede à dextris meis:* Our Lorde (the Father) said to my Lorde (the Sonne) sit at my right hand, is not the Omnipotencie of God the Sonne, and his Equalitie with the Father in these woordes signified, though the terme it selfe of omnipotencie, or equalitie, be not expressed?

*1. Reg. 31.*

It is written of kinge Saules wicked and miserable ende, *Arripuit Saul gáldium suum, & irruiť super eum:* Saul caught his owne sworde, and ranne vpon it: doth not the Scripture by those woordes shewe, and set forth his murthering and kylling of him selfe, though the terme it selfe of murdering, or killing be not expressely vttered?

*2. Reg. 11.*

Likewise the Scripture signifieth with very plaine woordes the Aduoutrie that Dauid committed with Bethsabée, and his murdering of Vrias her husband: and yet in what place these actes be described, there is not at al expressed, the terme of Aduoutrie, nor of Murder.

*Acton. 2.*

In the whole storie of Christes passion written by the Euangelistes, it is not with any expresse terme of killing said, that the Iewes or Souldiers killed him. Yet I trowe ye wil not denie, but that in woordes it is implied. If you denie it, S. Peter shal control you, who said to the Iewes, *Hunc interemistis*, this man ye haue

*Acton. 7.*

killed: S. Steuen also, who said vnto them, *cuius vos nunc proditores & homicida fuistis*, ye haue now ben the  
trai-

traitours and murderers of Iesus.

But what neede we to vse so many examples in a matter, that may be declared by infinite examples? Right so ( to be shorte ) the wordes which the Euangelistes, and S. Paule vse in the Description of the Institution of the blessed Sacrament at Christes last supper, be wordes implying and importing a Sacrifice, albe it this terme it selfe of *Oblation*, or *Sacrifice*, be not expressed. And who so euer affirmeth him that so saith, to include a Contradiction: is either a wrangler hunting for termes, not regarding the thing implied, or very ignorant, not knowing the nature of a Contradiction.

But besides al this, as M. Iewel hath founde in my wordes a Contradiction, where none is, so doth he also with like truth, and like proufe, charge me with ( as it pleaseth him to terme it ) *straggling alone*, and swaruing from al the olde Fathers, by a strange construction of myne owne, for that I haue so construed the wordes vsed in the Scripture to declare the Institution of the Eucharist, as to include and implie a Sacrifice. For verely I haue learned this construction of the olde learned Fathers, and haue not bene so presumptuous, as in so weighty a mater to trust the deuise of myne owne head. Which Fathers doo not onely in equiualent, but in expresse termes declare, that Christe offered a Sacrifice at his last supper.

*Hesychius* an olde Father maketh mention of three sundry Sacrifices, that Christe offered: two at his Maundie, and the thirde vpon the Crosse. His wordes be plaine. *Prius figuratam Ouem cœnans cum Apostolis, postea suum obtulit Sacrificium: & deinde sicut ouem se-*

No cōt a  
dictiō pro  
ued by M.  
Iewel to  
be in the  
Answer.

There  
proche of  
straggling  
alone ana  
swered.

Three sa  
crifices  
offered by  
Christe.  
*Hesychius*  
in *Leuit.*  
*lib. 2. cap. 8*

R. iij

ipsum

Diuis. 4.

A Reioindre to M. Jewels Replie

That  
Christe sa-  
crificed hi  
selfe at his  
last supper

*ipsum occidit.* Christe supping with his Apostles, first offered the figuratiue Lambe, afterward he offered his owne Sacrifice: and then after that he killed him selfe (that is to say, deliuered vp him selfe to be killed) like a Lambe.

Cyprian.  
lib. 2. epist.  
3.

S. Cyprian one of the most auncient Fathers of the Church, speaking of the Figure of Melchisedech, geueth most iust occasion of this construction, where he saith, *Quam rem perficiens & adimplens Dominus, panem & calicem mixtum vino obtulit, & qui est plenitudo, Veritatem praefiguratae Imaginis adimpleuit.* Which thing our Lorde performing and fulfilling (he meaneth the performance of that which Melchisedeks Sacrifice did fore signifie) offered bread, and the cuppe mingled with wine, and he who is the fulnesse, did fulfil the Truth of the forefigured Image.

Theophylactus in  
Matt. 26.

Theophylactus although not so olde as the others, yet a schoolemaister olde yenough to teach a Christian man this construction, expounding the later wordes of the Institution of the Sacrament, and speaking of the Sacrifice, saith: *Sicut Vetus Testamentum immolationem habebat & sanguinem, ita Nouum Testamentum sanguinem habet ac immolationem.* Like as the Olde Testament had sacrifice and bloude: euen so the Newe Testament hath bloude and Sacrifice. Here is to be considered, that if the wine by th'almighty power of the Worde be not co-uered into the bloud of Christe, but remaine stil wine, as before consecration, which doctrine our Calvinistes teach, and the Lutherans impugne: then wil not this comparison of Theophylactus holde, neither is it true at al, that now the Newe Testament hath bloude.

Enthy-

*Euthymius* also a Father of the Greke Church, construed the same wordes of Christe in like sense, saying, *Sicut Vetus Testamentum hostias & sanguinem habebat, ita sanè & Nouum, Corpus videlicet & sanguinè Domini. Non dixit autem, hæc sunt signa corporis mei, & sanguinis mei, sed hæc sunt corpus meum, & sanguis meus.* As the Olde Testament had sacrifices and bloude, euen so truly hath the New Testament also, to wit, the Body and Bloud of our Lorde. He said not, these be the signes of my body, and of my bloud, but these be my Body, and my Bloude.

These Fathers, and sundry others, whose sayinges here to reherse I omit that I be not tedious, avouching so plainely, that a Sacrifice was offered by Christe at his Maundie: I maruel at the impudencie of *M. Iewel*, who solacing him selfe with the terme of *straggling alone*, reporteth me in this point to swarue from al the olde Fathers, as though I had deuised a newe construction, that any learned man neuer knewe before. Verely in denyng this Sacrifice, he sheweth him selfe to be departed from Christes folde the Church, and like a lost shepe to straggle alone, and to wander from the saued flocke. Our Lorde yet turne his harte, and kepe him from the wolues and roaring Lion, that neuer ceaseth going about, and seeking whom he may deuour.

*Euthym.*  
in Matt.

It is M.  
Lev. v. that  
in deede  
straggleth  
alone.

1. Pet. 5.

*Iewel.*

Verily yf this Latine vworde, *Dare, be*, Sacrificare: and, *Geuinge, be Sacrificinge*, then, vwhere as *S. Paule saithe*, If thine enimie be thirtie, Geue him drinke: And vwhere as *Iudas saithe*, VWhat wil ye Geue me, and I wil deliuer him vnto you: And, vwhere as the foolish Virgins saie, Geue vs parte of your Oile &c. In euerie of these, and suche other like places, by this Neyve Diuinitie, *M. Harding* vvil be

Roman. 15  
Matt. 26.  
Matt. 25.

hable.



hable to finde a Sacrifice.

Harding.

Forth you go, rather ieasting and scoffing, then proving ought, or disproving. If *Dare*, be *Sacrificare*, and *geuing be sacrificing*, say you: then where so euer in the Scriptures the worde *Dare*, which signifieth to geue, is found, there must be concluded a Sacrifice. And so sacrifice must be done vnto Iudas, bicause he said, *Quid vultis mihi dare*, What wil ye geue me, and I wil deliuer him vnto you?

Matt. 26.

M. Iewvel  
fondly argues  
gueth fro  
the special  
to the general  
affirmatiuely.

The sadnesse of this mater M. Iewel, beareth not wel your lightnesse. Praised be God, that his enemies wittes finde so litle weight of reason, or learning, in impugning his truth. You knowe, that I make not *geuing*, to be *sacrificing*, nor that *Dare* should alwaies signifie *sacrificare*. Which if it be not presupposed, your Argument is peeuiſh. For what if *Datur*, in the wordes of Christes Institution of the Sacrament (for thereto onely my saying is restrained) do founde to some learned men, as much as *offeritur*, specially in that place, where the addition of these two woordes, *pro vobis*, for you, is withal to be considered: wil it thereof folowe, that euey where els, *Dare*, be *sacrificare*, and that *geuing be sacrificing* in general?

By this your Logique it wil folow, that bicause this worde *calix*, is taken sometimes for passion, and tribulation, as where Christ said, *transcat a me calix iste*, let this cuppe passe from me, and likewise in other places: wher it is written of Christe being at his last supper, *accipiens Calicem gratias egit*, He tooke the Cuppe, and gaue thanks

Matt. 26.

Luc. 22.

Iohn. 13.



thanks, it must be interpreted, Christ tooke his passion, and gaue thanks: whereby it is concluded, that he suffered his passion at his supper in the euening, and not on the morow, onlesse it be said, that he suffered his passion twice. By this it is made cleare, how fondly you reason.

How be it I iudge, if you were wel examined, your selfe would not denie, but that *Dare*, may signifie *offerre*, Dare, used  
for offerre. where the circumstance of the place reporteth Christe to geue his body, or him self for vs, or for our synnes, specially when being spoken of Christe, it is put with this Proposition *pro*. This if you deny, S. Paule shal conuince you, writing to the Galathians, *Gratia vobis & pax a Deo Patre nostro, & Domino Iesu Christo, qui dedit semetipsum pro peccatis nostris, ut eriperet nos de presenti seculo nequam.* Grace and peace be to you from God our Father, and our Lorde Iesus Christe, who gaue him selfe for our sinnes, to deliuer vs from this present wicked world. Now if *dare*, be *offerre* in this place, why may it not signifie the same in the wordes of the Sacraments institution, where Christ also gaue his body and bloude, not only vnto vs, to be a foode, which no man denieth: but also for vs, to be a Sacrifice, which our newe Gospellers denie, and I now haue proued? Galat. iii.

Iewel.

Yet, saith he, Certaine menne of excellent knowledge haue thus expounded it. It seemeth very strange, that these so notable men of excellent knowledg should haue no names. Perhappes he meaneth Tapper of Louaine, or Cropper of Colaine, of whom he hath borowed the vphole substance vneare of al this Article. How be it, the demaunde was of the Ancient Doctors of the Church: not of any of these, or other such petite Fathers.

Harding.

I said not, as you reporte me, that certaine men of excellent knowledge haue thus expounded it, but that to some such men, *Datur*, here foundeth nolesse then *offertur*, specially in cōsideration of the addition, *pro vobis*. And therein I said truly. And though I named them not, yet was there no cause, why you should make so strāge a mater of it, as though worthy men had no names. Bicause some of them be yet liuing, I thought it better not to name them. If I had meāt Tapper of Louaine, as I did not, or Gropper of Coulen: I had meant men in dede wel knownen, and cōmended vnto the worlde, both for excellent learning, and singular vertue. How so euer it please you in contempt to cal them petite Fathers.

Tapper,  
Gropper.

These, or others like them, if I solow, and helpe my selfe in this, or any other question, with their or with any other mennes knowledge: what skilleth that, so that I mainteine nothinge but the truth? If you thought to abase myne estimation with the report of helping my selfe with other mennes labours, you are deceiued, the thing is lawful and commendable. Neither ought that to grieue me being obiected by you, who, as it is wel knownen, haue taken the parcels of the false wares packt together in your Replie, out of other mennes shoppes, I meane the Lutherans, and Calvinistes of our age, who haue impugned the Catholike Religion, fithens Luther beganne to write against the Church.

Jewel.

*But Christe saith in the Present Tense: This is my Bodie, That is Geuen; not in the Future Tense, That shalbe Geuen. And likewise*

*wise*, This is my Bloude, That Presently is shēad: not in the Future Tense, That shalbe Shead. Therefore Christ sacrificed his Body, and I head his bloude presently at the Supper.

Here M. Harding is driven to control the olde Common Translation of the new testament, not only, that beareth the name of S. Hierome, and hath ben evermore generally receiued in the Church, and is allowved by the Councel of Tridente, but also, that is stil vsed, and continued in his owne Masse Booke. I graunte, In the Greeke it is vvriten, Datur, Is Geuen: not Dabitur, shalbe Geuen. But here the Present Tense, according to the Common Phrase of the Scriptures, is vsed for the Future Chrysostome readeth it thus, Dabitur, shalbe Geue: not Datur, Is geuen. Origen likewise readeth, not, Effunditur, Is Shead. but, Effunderetur, Shalbe Shead. And in this sorte Chrysostom also expoundeth it: Effunderetur pro multis. Hoc dicens, ostendit, quod Passio eius. Mysterium Salutis humane per quod etiam Discipulos consolatur. Shalbe shēad for many. Thus saying, he sheweth, that his Passio is the Mysterie of the Saluation of mankinde: and by the same he comforteth his Disciples. *Againe he saith*. De Passione, & Cruce sua loquebatur. *Chrysost.* Christe (*vitering the vvordes of the Sacramente*) spake of his Passio, *in Catena.* and of his Crosse.

*Harding.*

Touching that I noted Christes wordes concerning his body and bloude, to be spoken in the present Tense, *Datur*, is geuen, and *funditur*, is shed: there was no iust cause, why you should say, that I am driven to control the Olde common Translation of the new testament. Who so euer cōtrollēth any thing, findeth fault with the same. As for the Olde Translation of that place, I take not vpon me to findē faulte with it. It standeth not with the humilitie and modestie of such as be Catholik, to control that Translation, which hath bene corrected by S. Hierom (as it is beleued) so generally receiued in the Church,

The olde  
texte by  
me not  
control-  
led, as M<sup>r</sup>  
levvel  
saith.

S ij and

and also wel allowed by sundry Councels. We leaue that pride, and temeritie vnto the sawcinesse of them of your side : who as wel in Latine, as in their vulgar tongues, haue presumed of their owne heades, to set forth very many new Translations, not one wholly agreeing with another. And yet eche one must boldly and stoutely be a- uouched to be Gods worde.

As for my selfe, I doo gladly imbrace and folow the olde common Translation, confessing the sense and mea- of the verbes in the future tense to be true according to the Latine texte. Neuer the lesse perceiuing that al the Greekes, in whose tongue the greatest parte of the new Testament was first writtē, and that many of the Latines, and their bookes, as S. Ambrose, and S. Bede, and the new Testament of *Isidorus Clarus* printed in Venis, with o- thers, do reade those verbes *datur, frangitur, effunditur*, is geuen, is broken, is shed, in the present tense, and that not without cause and reason : I thought good thereon to ground an Argument for my purpose, and to take the ad- uantage of *that text*, without controlment of the other.

*Ambros. in*  
*11. cap. 1.*  
*ad Corint.*  
*Beda. In*  
*Luc. cap.*  
*22.*

Chryso-  
stom bel-  
ied by M.  
Iewell.  
Chryso. in  
1. Corin. 11.

*Chryso. readeth Dabitur, shalbe geuen, say you, not datur, is geuen.* For trutthes sake, I must streine nourture, and tel you truely, you say false of Saint Chrystome. The Latine Chrystome hath in two places, *traditur*, shalbe deliuered : in both it is corrected in the Margent, where, for *traditur*, is noted, *frangitur*, and in both those places the Greke hath *κλάμενον*, which be- ing spoken of our Lordes Body, is as much to say, as, *bro- ken*, in the present tense. As for your *Dabitur*, shalbe geuen, it is of your owne forging: the woorde is not in S. Chrystome in the place by you coted. And the olde  
common

common texte it selfe in S. Luke, hath *datur*, is geuen, *Luc. 22.* and not *dabitur*, shal be geuen.

And as the Latine translatour hath made S. Chrysostome to speake otherwise in Latine, then he speaketh in Greke, putting *tradetur*, for *frangitur*: euen so hath he done, who so euer translated Origen, whom you allege, placing *effundetur*, shal be shed, in the future tense, for *effunditur*, is shed, in the present tense. Except therefore you can shewe vs the Greke Origen, your Latine Origen is to proue your future tense of that verbe, of as smal autoritie, as the Latine Chrysostome is now shewed to be, for proufe of your false reported, *Dabitur*.

How be it that Origen in his owne tongue would say *effunditur*, and not *effundetur*, it may partly be gathered by that foloweth in him a fewe lines after the place, which you haue alleged. For there thus we reade in the present Tence. *Hic est Sanguis meus novi Testamenti, qui & bibitur, et effunditur, &c.* This is my bloude of the new Testamēt, which both is droonke, and is shed. But whereas Origen treateth vpon S. Matthew, how is it to be thought, that he being a Greke writer, would recite the texte of the Euangelist otherwise, then he founde it in the Greke, where it is not reade *effundetur*, in the future tense, as you woulde haue it, but, *ἐκχυνόμενον, quod effunditur*, which is shed, by a participle of the present tense?

As for that you bring out of *Catena aurea* of S. Thomas, you haue fowly falsified it. For neither hath S. Chrysostome, nor S. Thomas, as you reherse the wordes. For these wordes, *effundetur pro multis*, be not placed immediatly before this sentence, *Hoc autem dicens &c.* Which S. Tho-

Reasons,  
why Origen se-  
meth to  
be belyed  
by M.  
levvel.  
Origen in  
Matth.  
tract. 35.

Matt. 26.  
Matc. 14.

S. Tho-  
mas in  
Catena,  
falsified  
by M.  
levvel.



mas allegeth as out of an Homilie of S. Chrysostome: For a saying of S. Remigius, and certaine other wordes, are put betwene, so that the same sentence is to be referred to that went before, *pro multis*, or, *in remissionem peccatorum*.

S. Thomas a  
gainst fal  
sified by  
M. Iew.

Your other place also alleged out of Catena, containeth the like falshod. For whereas by your owne forged parenthesis (uttering these wordes of the Sacrament) you would restraine S. Chrysostomes wordes to the mention of the Sacrament, which neuerthelesse in a right sense may be graunted: therby craftily ye would bereue the blessed Sacrament altogether of the truth of Christes body and bloude. Now S. Thomas in Catena allegeth S. Chryso-

In Catena  
in 26. cap.  
Matt.

stome thus. *Quia verò de passionē & cruce eis locutus erat, consequenter eum qui de Resurrectione est sermonem inducit, dicens, Dico autem vobis, non bibam ammodo &c.* Bicause

he had spoken vnto them of his Passiō and Crosse, ther vpon he bringeth in talke of his Resurrection, saying, I tel you, I wil not drinke henceforth, &c. Now the talke that Christ had with his disciples of his passiō and Crosse, appereth other wheres at his supper, then in the wordes

Matth. 26

of the Sacrament. For there he said, *Verely I say vnto you, that one of you shal betray me.* Againe, *The sonne of man goeth, as it is written of him, &c.* Item, *I haue very much desyred to eate this Pasceouer with you, before that I suffer my*

Antequā  
patiar.

passion. In consideration of these, and other the like

Luc. 22.

wordes spoken by Christ at his last supper, and not only or chiefly of the wordes of the Sacramēt, S. Chrysostom

M. Jewels  
falshod  
depre  
hended.

saith, as he is alleged in Catena, that Christ had spoken of his passiō and Crosse. And thus your falshod M. Iewel is disclosed on euery side, so much, that in manner your

whole

whole processe against this Article hitherto, is founde to be none other but a continual lye.

But Sir, when you pryed so much in that Homilie of S. Chrysostome, to finde your forged worde, *Dabitur*, which is not in him to be found: what eyes had you, that you sawe not in him so plaine, and so expresse mention, both of the real Presence, and of the Sacrifice? Els if you saw it, why do you dissemble it? Yea, why do you denie it?

Real presence, and Sacrifice auouched by Saint Chrysostom. Dissembled by M. Iew.

There demaunding of him selfe, wherefore he that eateth this bread, and drinketh the cuppe of our Lorde vnworthily, shal be guilty of the body, and bloude of our Lorde: doth he not answer, *because he hath shed the bloud, and so hath shewed the thing to be a slaughter, and not only a Sacrifice*? Doth he not compare him that doth communicate vnworthily, vnto the tormentours, who, when they pearced the body of Christ, did not pearse it to thintent to drinke, but to shed his bloude? Now if there be no real bloude at al in the dredful Mysteries, but Symbolical and tokening wine only: what reason were it so expressly to charge the vnworthy receiuer with the hairous crime of shedding Christes bloude? Were your Sacramentarie doctrine true, the vnworthy communicant deserueth otherwise to be reprehended, he can not truly be called a shedder of Christes bloude. For where no bloud is, there can not bloude be shed pardy.

Chrysost. in. 1. Cor. 11. Homil. 27. σφάγις.

Yet here to auoid the wicked carping of a Sacramentarie, where S. Chrysostome termeth the vnworthy receiuing of Christes bloude, σφάγις that is to say, slaughter, likewise spilling and shedding of his bloude: we knowe that it is not a slaughter in deede concerning Christes.

In vvhatsense is slaughter committed by the vnworthy receiuer.

Rom. 6. Christes parte, for Christe can no more be slaine, and being now risen from the dead, he dieth no more, deah shal no more haue maisterie ouer him: as S. Paule saith. But it is slaughter on the vnworthy receiuers parte, bicause by his vnworthy receiuing he doth as it were shed and spille for so much as in him lyeth, and caste away the bloude of Christ. Which thing though he doo it not visibly, yet doth he it truly not by sensible way of doing, but bicause wickedly he presumeth to abuse that, which is the very substance of the precious bloude, by vertue of the worde of consecration made really present.

Sacrifice  
auouched  
by Saint  
Chryso-  
stom.

To be shorte, verely in that. 27. Homilie vpon the first epistle to the Corinthians, S. Chrysostome calleth the body of Christ present by consecration, a Sacrifice sundry times, and in the. 28. Homilie that foloweth, he nameth it, τὴν καθαράν ἐκείνην θυσίαν, *illud purū Sacrificium*, that pure Sacrifice, with the pronounne ἐκείνην (which importeth a special notification) signifying it to be Singular aboue other Sacrifices.

Touching the Present Tense, in which the wordes of the Institutiō of the Sacrament be expressed, whereof I gathered an Argumēt for the Sacrifice at the Supper: for answer therto M. Iewel saith, that it is the cōmon Phrase of the Scriptures, to use the present Tense for the future. But this confuse and vncertaine answer, putteth not away the force of my Argument. For what meaneth he? That the present Tense be taken for the Future, is it cōmon to the whole Scriptures, and to euery parte, or to some partes only? He wil not affirme it of the whole, I crowe. For so he should be guilty of denying Christ to become, and of many other great vnruthes, and absurdities. So, whereas the

the voice of God the Father said of Christ, *This is my beloved sonne, in whom I am wel pleased:* we should take it, as though God had meât, this is he that is not yet my sonne, but, that shal be my sonne. And where Christ said to the Samaritane woman, *I am Mesiias or Christe, euen I that speake with thee:* that should we expounde of the time to come, that he shal be Mesiias. Which doctrine maketh a right way for Antichrist, who is to come.

Matth. 3.  
6. 17.

Iohn. 4.

If he sooth his saying of some parte of the Scriptures, the same I graunt also, specially of the olde Testament, where prophecies are vitered of thinges to come in the new Testament. But it had ben his parte to prooue (onlesse his profession be to prooue nothing, and to stand only in denials) that in the Institution of the Sacrament the Present Tense standeth for the future, and that so, as the thing signified may not by any conuenient sense be verified in the Present Tense. For els if it might, how much better were it to expounde it of both Tenses, then of one onely, that Christes saying might thoroughly, and on euery side appeare true? And if it may appeare true for the Present Tense, then so farre forth standeth my reason in force, and is not yet repelled.

Whereas then I said in my Answer, that Christ gaue his body for vs, and shed his bloude at his supper, which againe I affirme to be true in a right sense: that I said not the same altogether without the authoritie of certaine olde and learned Fathers, and therefore neither strangely, nor alone, as M. Iewell chargeth me: by that whiche here foloweth, it shal appeare. I reporte me to Gregorie Nyssen S. Basils brother, and to Theophylacte.

That  
Christ  
gaue his  
body for  
vs, and  
shed his  
bloud at  
the sup-  
per, affir-  
med by  
certaine  
Fathers.



Diuiſ. 4.

A Reioindre to M. Iewels Replie

Gregor.  
Nyſſ. De  
Reſurre-  
ctione  
Chriſti,  
Oraſio. 1.

Gregorie Nyſſen ſaith thus. *Pro ineffabili arcanoque, & qui ab hominibus cerni nequit, ſacrificij modo, ſua diſpoſitione & adminiſtratione preoccupat impetum violentum, ac ſeſe Oblationem ac victimam offert pro nobis, Sacerdos ſimul & Agnus Dei, qui tollit peccatum mundi. Quando hoc accidit? Quum ſuum corpus ad comedendum, & ſanguinem ſuum familiaribus ad bibendum praeſtuit. Cuilibet enim hoc perſpicuum eſt, quod one. veſci homo non poſſit, niſi maſtatio comeſtionem praecerit. Qui igitur dedit diſcipulis ſuis corpus ſuum ad comedendum, aperte demonſtrat, iam perfectam & abſolutam factam eſſe immolationem. &c.*

Chriſt at  
the ſup-  
per, both  
Priest.  
and Labe.

Chriſt after a manner of ſacrifice, that is vnſpeakeable, ſecret, and ſuch as can not be ſene of men, by his owne diſpoſition and adminiſtration preuenteth the violent af- fault (that afterward was made) and offereth him ſelfe an Oblation and Sacrifice for vs, being the Prielt, and alſo the Lambe of God, that takerh away the ſynne of the worlde. When was this done? At what time he gaue vnto them of his houſeholde his body to be eaten, and his bloude to be droonke. For to euery one this is a cleare mater, that a man may not eate of the Lambe, except killing go before the eating. Whereas then he gaue vnto his diſciples his body to eate, he ſheweth euidently, that a perfite and abſolute immolation (or Sacrifice) was now made.

What can M. Iewel require more? This learned Fa- ther ſaith, that Chriſt *preuented the violence and furie of the Iewes*, meaning that he did vnto him ſelfe that at the Supper, which was done on the morow with the vio- lence of them that crucified him. Wherby neuertheleſſe he vnderſtandeth the myſtical Oblation of him ſelfe, not  
the



the manner of his bloudy Oblation . For he confesseth it to be secret, inuisible, and vnspokeable . And that no man should doubt of this Sacrifice , he ascribeth vnto him both the office of a Priest , and also of the Lambe. As a Priest , he sacrificed , as the Lambe , he was sacrificed.

For the better vnderstanding of this point, the Sacrifice at the Supper , and that on the morow vpon the Crosse , may truly be accompted and named one Sacrifice, and also diuers Sacrifices . Neither is this Sophistrie good Reader , as these newe Gospellers wil beare thee in hande : by this true distinction , sophistical obiections and wranglings of the Gospellers may reasonably be answered. How then is it one, how be they diuers ? Learne it once, and be no more contentious, as they be, who hauing heard it so oftentimes by the Catholikes tolde them, wil yet seme not to vnderstand it.

The sacrifice of the supper, and the sacrifice of the Crosse, one, and diuers, in diuers respects.

Before I answer to this question, this much is necessarily to be declared, that the name of Sacrifice , is wont to be taken sometime for the thing that is offred vnto God, sometime for the action it selfe of sacrificing. Now then it is one Sacrifice in respect of the thing offred and sacrificed, which is the body and bloude of Christ . For that is one and the selfe same in both, in the Supper, and vpon the Crosse . The Action is of two manners , bloudy , and vnbloudy . These Sacrifices be diuers in respect of the manner of the Action and of the offering. For in the Supper it was vnbloudy , and vpon the Crosse, it was bloudy .

Sacrifice, taken two vvaies.

Concerning the former Sacrifice , in deede al dependeth of the real presence , that is to say , vpon the

T ij the

the credite of Christes worde, whereby his body and bloude is both professed to be present, and is made really present. Which if it were truly beleued, al contention about the Sacrifice were sone ended. And yet hath that point of late bene learnedly, and substantially entreated by D. Heskins, and by D. Saunder, who hath clearly answered, and refuted the obiections, what so euer Maister Iewel in his Replie was hable to bring to the contrary. But what shal we say? These mennes reasons may sone be answered, their pertinacie can neuer be answered. Of suche Tertulian faith, *ouercome they may be, persuaded they can not be.*

Tertull.  
in pra-  
script.

Theophy-  
lact. in  
Matt. ca.  
pita. 28.

Now to come vnto Theophylacte. His wordes be these, according to the Greke. *Quinta feria fecit Dominus carnem, & Discipulis dixit, Accipite, & comedite Corpus meum. Itaque quia potestatem ex se habebat ponendi animam suam, manifestum est, quod ex eo tempore immolauerit seipsum, quando tradidit discipulis suis corpus suum. Nemo enim comedit aliquid, nisi prius fuerit immolatum.* Vpon the fifth day our Lorde made his Supper, and said vnto his Disciples, take ye, and eate my body. So that bicause he had power of him selfe to put of his soule, it is manifest that from that time he sacrificed him selfe, when he delyuered his body vnto his Disciples. For no man doth eate any thing (at the solēitie of a sacrifice, so he meaneth) which is not sacrificed before.

What can be vttered in plainer termes, then that we find in these two Fathers? The one saith, that Christ offered him selfe, when he gaue his body and bloude vnto his Disciples. The other, that he preuented the violence that was done vnto him on the morow, and offered vp him

him selfe an Oblation and Sacrifice, performing the parte bothe of a Prieste, and of the Lambe. And least any man should myssetake them, vnderstanding it to haue ben done vpon the Crosse onely: with most expresse wordes they referre it vnto the Supper. And so by their doctrine be the verbes, *Datur, fragitur, effunditur, is geuen, is broke, is shed*, veresified in the present Tense, and not on-ly in the future Tense.

In these testimonies the cause, that both Nyssen, and Theophylacte geueth, why Christe offered his body, which he deliuered vnto his Disciples, is specially to be noted: which is, bicause in the solemnitie of Sacrifices, no mā eateth that which is not before sacrificed. Where- in they allude vnto the olde manner of Sacrifices, which alwaies were offered vp, before they were eaten. And so the body and bloude of our Sauour Christe our true Pas- chal Lambe, was at his Maundie, and now ought to be offered vp, before it was then, or now is to be eaten and dronke in the blessed Sacrament. Hefychius vttereth the like doctrine writing vpon the booke of *Leuiticus*.

*Hefychius*

*lib. 1. in*

*Leuit.*

*cap. 46.*

Iewel.

To be shorte, if it be true, that Christe shed his blood at his Last Sup- per, and that Verily, Really, and in deede, as M. Hardinge alone strangely auoucheth, and no man els, I trovve, beside him, then can he no more say, The same was an vnbloudy Sacrifice: And so must be yelde vp the strongest Towver of al his Holde. For ys the Sacrifice, that Christe made at his Supper vvere vnbloudy, how did Christ there shed his blood? If Christ as M. Harding saith, did there shed his Bloude, how can that Sacri- fice be called Vnbloudy?

But to leaue these fantasies, and vaine shifts, Christe gave his Bodie to be broken, and his Bloude to be shed, not at his Last Supper, but on-

I. iij.

ly vpon:

Diuiſ. 4.

*A Reioindre to M. Iewels Replie*

*ly vpon his Croſſe, and no vvere els. There he bare our iniquities: there*  
*Pſal. 53.* *was he rent for our Sinnes. And in that only reſpect vve receiue his bo-*  
*dy, and embrace it, and haue fruit of it. In this reſpect S. Paule ſaith, God*  
*Galat. 6.* *forbid, I ſhould reioice in any thing, ſauing onely in the Croſſe*  
*of our Lorde Ieſus Chriſte.*

*Therefore, this new Article of the faith, of the real ſacrificing, and*  
*ſhedding of Chriſtes blood at the table, neither being true in it ſelf, nor*  
*hitherto by M. Harding any way proued, nor vwithſtanding the great Stoare,*  
*and choiſe of his Authorities: for as much as Chriſt neuer gaue, neither his*  
*Apoſtles, nor any their ſucceſſours Commiſſion to do more in that behalfe,*  
*then he him ſelfe had done, To ſay, that any mortal man hath power, and*  
*authoritie, really, and in dede to Sacrifice the ſonne of God, it is a manifeſt,*  
*and vicked blaſphemie: the great, and groſſe errors, vwherevwith the Di-*  
*uel, and his Diſciples in the time of his kingdome of darkeneſſe haue de-*  
*ceiued the worlde, not vwithſtanding.*

*Harding.*

But here M. Iewel replieth, and would ſaine prooue  
a contradiction to be implied in this doctrine. I omit his  
falſifying of my Answer, affirming me to ſay, that Chriſte  
did ſhed his blood at his laſt Supper *verily, really, and in*  
*dede* (which I ſaid not, though it may be ſo ſaid in a right  
ſenſe): and much leſſe meant I, as thereby his intent is to  
report vnto the ſimple, to wit, an external, and ſenſible  
ſhedding, which was done only at the tyme of his Paſſiō.  
That the mater might ſeme the more abſurde and vnrea-  
ſonable, *If (ſaith he) Chriſtes Sacrifice made at the Supper*  
*were vnblondy, how then did he there ſhed his blood? If he did*  
*ſhed his blood, how can that Sacrifice be called vnblondy?*

Why Sir, wil you nedes haue the Myſteries of this Sin-  
gular and peerleſſe Sacrifice to be diſcuſſed by reaſon,  
and not to be conceiued only by faith? Wil you require  
the

the meane of this Sacrifice to be set forth euidently vnto you, which is secret as Nyssen before mentioned saith, inuisible, and vnspeakeable? S. Paule him selfe where he speaketh of the Priestthoode of Christe after the order of Melchisedek, saith he not, that *thereof he hath much to say*, Heb. 5. *and that the things be hard to expound?* These howes and questions M. Iewel become Iewes, Infidels, and Heretikes, much better then a true Christian man. Christes blood was shed at his Supper, so as it is now shed in the daily Sacrifice of the Aulter: that is to say, in a mysterie, and in a Sacrament, by a meane to man inuisible, and vnspeakeable.

Bicause his blood is beneficial vnto vs to redemption, in that it was once actually, externally, and with death drawn forth of his body: In cōsideration thereof, where so euer that blood is by the almighty power of our Lords worde in the Sacrifice made and exhibited, we thinke it no absurditie, nor inconuenience, to say, that his bloude is shed in a mysterie, and vnbloudily. Whereby we meane, that not only his memorie is celebrated, but also that the effecte of the bloody shedding of his bloude, that is to say, the effect of his death, is thereby applied vnto vs hauing faith, and being disposed, as we ought to be, as if he were now hanging on the Crosse, and presently bleeding before our eyes. For to shew this and that of the Crosse, to be one and the selfe Sacrifice, we offer him, saith Theophylact, *perinde ac si esset hoc tempore immolatus*, as if he were at this very time sacrificed. Againe, *hanc hostiam* laet. in *semper ut presentem offerimus*: we offer vp this hoste al- cap. 10. waies, as if it were present, saith he, meaning the visible ad Heb. presence vpon the Crosse: for otherwise it is present.

And



And therefore it may truly be termed an vnbloudy ſhedding of bloude, the terme of ſhedding being referred to the bloude by the power of the worde of conſecration made preſent, offered, preſented, and verily exhibited, the terme vnbloudy, referred to the manner of offering and exhibiting it without any ſuch violence, as was done vnto the perſon of Chriſte by the Souldiers, who with thornes, nailes, and ſpeare, drew bloud of him, when he hong on the Croſſe.

That no doubt remaine, to ſpeake ſo plainly as I can of this high Myſterie, thus it is. The bloude of Chriſte (we confeſſe) is the price of our Redemption, in that it was once ſhed vpon the Croſſe. That bloude, and body whereof it iſſued out, is the Hoſte of our Salvation. That very bloude is here made preſent in the Sacrifice of the Aulter by vertue of Chriſtes worde, and is ſaid preſently to be ſhed (whiche neuer the leſſe we vnderſtand to be done in myſterie and in remembrance of that which was ſhed vpon the Croſſe) becauſe the effecte of that external ſhedding by this is applièd vnto vs, as if it were now in our ſight offered and ſhed.

The vn  
bloudy  
ſhedding  
of bloud.

This ſhedding may be, and is called vnbloudy, as the offering and the Sacrificing of Chriſt, and as the death is called vnbloudy. For like as is the Sacrifice, ſuch is the Death. Where is bloudy Sacrifice, there is bloudy Death. Where is the vnbloudy Sacrifice, there is the vnbloudy Death, and conſequently the myſtical and vnbloudy Shedding of bloude.

But for better credite, and that it ſeme not ſtrange, let vs confirme this pointe with ſome teſtimonies of Ancient Fathers, where the like ſpeeches are vttered.

S. Gre-

S. Gregorie saith, *Christus in seipso immortaliter viuens, iterum in hoc mysterio moritur*. Christe, who liueth immortally in him selfe, in this Mysterie dieth againe. S. Augustine likewise. *Semel immolatus est in semetipso Christus: & tamen quotidie immolatur in Sacramento*. Christe was sacrificed in him selfe once: and yet is he sacrificed daily in a Sacrament. *Paschasius* saith in like manner. *Quotidie Christus mystice pro nobis immolatur, & Passio Christi in Mysterio traditur*. & c. Christe is daily sacrificed for vs mystically, and the Passion of Christe is in a mysterie deliuered.

Gregorius  
Dialog. 4.  
cap. 58.  
De consec.  
di. 2. Quid  
sit.  
August. e-  
pist. 23. De  
Consec. dist.  
2. Semel.  
De Consec.  
dist. 2. Ite-  
ratur.

To be shorte, *Eusebius Casariensis*, *Cyrillus*, S. Chrysostome, *Theophylacte*, *Euthymius*, S. Gregorie Nazianzen, and in manner all the other Fathers doo cal this, *Incruentam immolationem*, the vnbloudy sacrificing, and vnbloudy Hoste. By the whiche Christe to effecte is so sacrificed for vs, as to them who were present, when he offered him selfe on the Crosse, yet so, as this Sacrifice take effecte of that. And that there be truely and properly a Sacrifice, it is yenough, that Christes death be so now applyed to remission of synne, as if he him selfe now dyed.

In these former and the like sayinges, the Fathers doo set forth the way and meane of this Sacrifice, of this Death, and consequently of this shedding of Christes bloude: as they may seeme to signifie not obscurely their vnablenesse to expresse the same, terming it *Sacrifice in a Sacrament*, *Death in a Mysterie*, *Sacrificing mystical*. The whiche wordes, Sacrament, and Mysterie, doo not importe a signification of absence of the thing reported to be sacrificed, to be shed, and

to dye: but the secrete manner of sacrificing, shedding, and dying. And because this oblation is not with shedding of bloude, whiche bloude may presently be sene, but by application of the bloude already shed: it is of the auncient Fathers rightly called an vnbloudy Sacrifice.

Chrysost. in  
Psal. 95.

S. Chrysostome ioyning *Hofiam*, an Hoste, and *Incruentam*, Vnbloudy, together, could vnderstand an vnbloudy shedding of bloude in a Mysterie, and thought it not absurdo. Yet neuerthelesse a man that standeth wel in his owne conceite, and skanneth al Diuinitie by Phrases, as M. Jewel doth: might finde mater in it to vtter a scoffe or two, and demaunde of Chrysostome, if it be an Hoste, how is it vnbloudy? If it be vnbloudy, how can it be an Hoste, seeing that an Hoste hath not bene woont to be offered without bloudshedding?

Gregor.  
Nazian.  
in Carmi-  
nibus ad  
Episcopos.

Likewise S. Gregorie Nazianzen that great Diuine, hauing respect vnto the body and bloude of Christe offered by the Priestes in the Sacrament, feared not to set together *θυσίας*, sacrifices, and *ἀναιμάκτους*, vnbloudy, saying: *ὦ θυσίας ἀναιμάκτους ἱερῆς*, O ye Priestes that offer vp vnbloudy Sacrifices! And to put al out of doubre, that he meant it of the Sacrifice of the Body and Bloude of Christe: he addeth further in the same place: *ὦ μέγαλοιο πλάσμα Θεοῦ χεῖρας ὑμῶν φέροντες*. O yee that beare the wrought worke of Greate GOD in your handes! Whereby he meaneth the true and real Body of Christe in the Sacrament.

Theophylacte also among other is very plaine, where

where he saith thus. *Num & ipsi sine sanguine immola-*  
*mus? Omnino. Sed nunc reminiscimur mortis Domini.*

Theophy-  
lactus in  
10. cap. ad  
Hebr.

Do we also sacrifice without bloude? Yea verely. But  
now (in our Sacrifice) we remember the death of our  
Lorde. The Greke woorde, which Theophylacte vseth  
is such as properly signifieth the killing of a lyuing  
thing. Here is a woorde alone for M. Iewel to vt-  
ter his scoffing eloquence vpon. Do we kill? Then how  
without bloude? If without bloude, how then do we  
kill?

Thus the learned Fathers being perswaded,  
that through the almighty power of Christes woordes,  
his flesh and bloude are really exhibited, and made  
present in the Sacrament: thought it no absurditie in this  
singular Sacrifice, to ioyne those termes together,  
which in no truth could stand together in the order and  
manner of offering the olde sacrifices, or Christes Sa-  
crifice vpon the Crosse.

If M. Iewel wil here replie and say, that the ioy-  
ning of these vnagreeing termes together is an Argu-  
ment, that the Fathers meant not to auouche a true and  
Real Sacrifice, but a figuratiue Sacrifice onely: how  
can it not appeare most absurde, to thinke that, whereas  
they affirme Christes Real flesh and bloude to be made  
present by vertue of his woorde, to thende it be the Sa-  
crifice of the newe Testament, and likewise where as  
they teache this Sacrifice and this hoste to be one with  
that of the Crosse: they should meane no true and Real  
Sacrifice, but onely a Figuratiue Sacrifice?

And wilt thou vnderstand Christian Reader, how  
the olde Fathers of the Church meane, where they

In what  
sense the  
Fathers  
make the  
sacrifice  
of the  
Aulter,  
and of the  
Crosse,  
one Sa-  
crifice.

Chrysost.  
homil. 17.  
in Epist.  
ad Heb.

Hacra-  
tiane.

reporte the Sacrifice of the Aulter; to be one with the Sacrifice of the Crosse? Verely they meane, as euery where we teache, the Hoste, or the thinge sacrificed, to be one, and the very selfe same, vpon the Aulter, and vpon the Crosse. For witnessse hereof heare S. Chrysostome. Hauing asked this question, *Quomodo una est Hostia, & non multa?* How is it one Hoste, and not many? After a few wordes he saith: *Id ipsum semper offerimus. Nec nunc quidem alium agnum, crastina alium, sed semper eundem ipsum. Proinde unum est hoc Sacrificium, hac ratione.* We offer vp alwaies the selfe same thing. Neither doo we offer one Lambe to day, an other to morow, but alwaies one the selfe same. Therefore this is but one Sacrifice, by this reason, or in consideration hereof, that is to say, bicause the thinge whiche is offered, is one. *Christe is our high Bishop* (there saith he further) *which hath offered vp the hoste that cleanseth vs* (of our sinnes) *the same offer we now also, which being then offered, can not be consumed.* If we offer the same hoste and sacrifice, that Christe offered, whereby we are made cleane from our sinnes, whiche is the sacrifice of the Crosse: it foloweth, that this be a true and real sacrifice (in respect of the thing sacrificed) as that was. By this M. Jewel may vnderstand, how lawfull it is for me to speake, as the catholique Church speake, that Christe is offered vp vnto his Father by the Priestes of the new Testament, *verely, really, and in deede.* Now let vs see what substance there is in al that, wherewith he burdeneth me touching S. Clement.



*Jewel.*

As for Clemens, whom M. Harding so often calleth the Apostles fellowe, as he is but lately start vp, and come abroad, and therefore hath not yet gotten sufficient credit, and in here brought in dumme, and saicing nothing, so is he not worthy of further answeare. Howe be it M. Harding dooth greate wrong, otherwise to report his Authours wordes, then he findeth them. Truly his Clemens, what so euer he were, saith not, The Priest hath Commisio, or Power, to offer vp the Sonne of God. His wordes are plaine to the contrary: Antytipon Regalis Corporis Christi offert: Offer ye vp (not the Bodie of Christe, but) the Signe, or Sacramente of the Roial Bodie of Christe. Likewise againe he saith, Offerimus tibi Regi, & Deo iuxta Institutionem Christi, Hunc Panem, & hoc Poculum: VVee offer vp vnto thee, our Kinge and God (not the very Bodie of thy Sonne Really, and in dede, but) This Breade, and this Cuppe, accordinge to Christs Institution. It is a greate Prerogative for M. Harding, both to make Doctours of his owne, and also to geue them his owne Constructions.

Clemens  
Constit.  
Apostoli.  
lib. 6.  
cap. 30.  
Clemens  
Constit.  
Apostol.  
lib. 8.

*Harding.*

First, he laboureth to put him out of credite, to that ende vsing pretty light termes, but neuer a weighty reason. He is but lately start vp, and come abroad, saith he. For whereas I cal him the Apostles fellow (and that not often as he saith) he should be offended with the Apostles, who so vsed him, and with S. Hierome, who so calleth him. Next, he reproveth me after his scoffing manner, for that I bring him in dumme, and saying nothing. Lastly, he chargeth me with reporting my authours wordes otherwise then I finde them.

Philip. 4.  
Hierony.  
in peroratione traslationis, ad finem Ceterarum Originis in epist. ad Romanos.

That S. Clement can not truly be said, lately to haue started vp, as it pleaseth M. Jewel to speake, I haue in my

Page. 29. b

Reioindre to his first Article, sufficiently proued his Antiquitie, and authoritie, as there the Reader may see.

S. Cles  
mēt not  
brought  
in dūme.

I do not bring him in dumme. To referre the Reader vnto a special place of a writer, is not to bring him in dumme. So I in my Answer referred the Reader to the eight booke and last chapter of S. Clements Constitutions. There shal he finde a cleare testimonie for the vnbloudy Sacrifice, for the Priesthod, and for the Institution, and commaundement of the exercise of the same, al which M. Iewel denieth. The wordes for breuities sake I reherſed not. To aduertise the Reader of the place, I thought it yenough.

Clemens  
in Con-  
stitut. li. 8  
cap. ult.

Christe  
made Sas-  
crifice be-  
fore his  
Passion,  
and com-  
maunded  
the same  
to be cō-  
tinued.

Least M. Iewel charge me againe with S. Clements dumnesse, certaine of his wordes, here briefly to satisfie the man, I am content to allege. Thus then he saith. *Christe the only begoten (sonne of God) by nature is the first high Bishop, who tooke not honour vnto him selfe, but was ordeined of his Father, who for our sake being made man, and offering a spiritual Sacrifice vnto God and his Father, before his passion commaunded vs (his Apostles) alone to do the same: albeit there were others present with vs, that belueed in him, but every one that beleueth, is not forth with a priest, nor hath Bishopply honour.*

Spiritual.

Here haue we expresse, and plaine mention of the Sacrifice, which Christe, as high Bishop offered vp vnto God his Father, and commaunded his Apostles to offer the same, before his passion. This Sacrifice he calleth Spiritual, in respecte of the sacrifices of Moyſes lawe, which were grosse and bodily of brute beastes, meaning

*against the Sacrifice of the Masse.* 80

meaning the sacrifice of his body and bloude, spiritually, that is to say, with spiritual manner, and not with visible shedding of bloude offered, and that before his passion, whereby he signifieth the Sacrifice made at the Supper. And that it be not vnderstanded of the Sacrifice of Praise, or prayer onely, S. Clement saith it was such, as the Apostles only were commaunded to offer, for that they were Priestes.

Of what other sacrifice can M. Jewel vnderstand this, whiche Christe offered before his passion, and commaunded his Apostles, and Priestes onely to offer: but of the Sacrifice of his Body and blood, which there after a fewe wordes is called the pure and vnbloudy Sacrifice?

A testimony  
mony for  
the Sacri-  
fice of the  
Altare.

Of this Sacrifice he is to be expounded, where speaking of S. Steuen in the same chapter, he saith thus. *Whereas he was such, and so great a man, seruent in spirite, and saw Christe on the right hande of God; and the gates of heauen open: yet it appeareth nowhere, that he exercised those offices, which be not conuenient for the degree of Deaconskip, as that either he offered the Sacrifice, or laid handes vpon any, but kept the order of a Deacon vnto his ende.* As for the inward spiritual Sacrifices, as praise, thanks, a contrite harte, prayer and such the like: I trow M. Jewel wil not deny, but that S. Steuen did them before his martyrdom, and that the same were not vnconuenient for the order and degree of Deacons. And so S. Clement geueth vs a plaine testimonie for the Sacrifice of the Aulter, the ministracion whereof belongeth to the order of Priesthod only, which is about the order of Deaconskip.

But

M. Iewell  
taken in  
a manifest  
and  
foule contradiction.

But who would thinke, that M. Iewel, who is so busy to burthen other men with contradiction, yea where none is, would fall into the oversight of so foule a Contradiction him selfe? For what can be a more open contradiction, then to say, as he doth, that *S. Clement is brought in dumme, and saying nothing, and yet his woordes be misreported?* If he be brought in dumme, if he say nothing, then where be his woordes, that be misreported? If his woordes be misreported, how is he brought in dumme, how saith he nothing? I haue reade, where speech hath ben attributed to beastes, and Trees: but that a dumme mā, and one that saith nothing, speaketh, and vttereth woordes, as it is absurde in nature, so no man was euer so mad, as once to feine it. Thus whiles M. Iewel seeketh to skoffe S. Clement out of credite, he hath shewed him selfe worthy of smal prayse, and credite.

Antitypon  
doth  
not exclude  
the  
veritie of  
the mysteries.

As touching the worde, *Antitypon* vsed by S. Clement, whereof he taketh holde: it maketh litle for his purpose. In what Logique learned he to make this Argument, By S. Clement Priestes are required to offer vp *antitypō*, that is to say, the signe, figure, or sampler of Christes body: *Ergo*, they haue no commission, nor power to offer vp Christe him selfe? Where two thinges go together, it is a foolish reason, that with the affirmation of the one, concludeth the denial of the other. By suche Logique he may as wel denie Christe to be God, bicause he is Man.

For answer to this and the like cauilles made by the Sacramentaries against the veritie of Christes body and bloude in the blessed Sacrament, it shal be necessary to in-

to informe the Reader of the doctrine of S. Augustine touching this very point. His wordes be these. *Hoc est quod dicimus, quod omnibus modis approbare contendimus, Sacrificium Ecclesia duobus confici, duobus constare, visibili elementorum specie, & inuisibili Domini nostri Iesu Christi carne & sanguine. & Sacramento. & re sacramenti, id est, corpore Christi. &c.* This is that we say, that we go about by al meanes to approue. That the Sacrifice of the Church is made of two thinges, and consisteth of two thinges, the visible forme of the elementes, and the inuisible flesh and bloud of our Lorde Iesus Christe, both the Sacrament, and the thing of the Sacrament, that is to say, the body of Christe.

Augu. lib.  
Sententiar.  
Prosperi.  
de Consec.  
Dist 2.  
Hoc est  
quod.

Now where as the Sacrifice consisteth of two thinges, the visible forme of the elementes, which are bread and wine, and the flesh and bloude of our Lorde: S. Clement naming *antitypon regalis corporis*, the signe, figure, or sampler of Christes roial body meaneth the visible forme of the elementes, as vnder them the body, and bloude is really contained. And so by this woorde *antitypon*, he vnderstandeth not the outward formes of breade and wine only, but (as in the same sentence he plainly expoundeth him selfe) the whole Sacrament, otherwise called the Euchariste. Which Sacrament is after consecration not without reason termed *antitypon*, partly in consideration of the outward formes, partly because the external breaking and diuision of the blessed Sacrament representeth and becometh Christes passion and bloude shedding. Also, because we haue not yet the fruition of Christes body after such wise, as we shal haue in the life to come. Here we haue Christe verily; in deede, and sub-

For what,  
*antitypon*  
is taken  
in S. Cle-  
ment.



stantially, but as yet couered in a mysterie, and hidden vnder the outward formes. But in the life to come we shal see him face to face, not as through a glasse, or darke contemplation: but euen so as he is in truth of his owne Maiestie.

That the  
terme  
antitypon,  
maketh  
nothing  
for the Sa-  
cramen-  
tarie.

Bicause the Sacramentaries, where, with al their witte and cunning they impugne the Sacrifice of the Aulter, pretend to haue great aduantage against the Catholikes, for that S. Basil and certaine other olde Fathers vse this terme, *antitypon*, where they speake of the most blessed Sacrament, calling it by that name: It shal be good to shew, how litle the vse of the same in the Fathers writings maketh for proufe of their heresie, which they mainteine against the real presence.

First it is acknowledged and confessed of the Catholikes, that the Sacrament of the Aulter is *antitypon*, that is to say, a sampler, or signe of Christes roial body: otherwise it could not be a Sacrament, which is a visibie signe of inuisibie grace. Thus farre we agree on both sides. The point wherein we vary frō the Sacramētaries, is touching the substance of the Sacramēt, or (which is al one though in diuers respectes) the Sacrifice.

We say, that onlesse the flesh and bloude of Christe be the substance of this sampler or signe, it can not be a Sacrament meete for the dignitie of the new Testament: bicause it must be the truth of al the figuratiue Sacrifices of the olde Lawe, according to that S. Augustine teacheth speaking of the Table, which Christe being a Priest after the order of Melchisedech doth exhibite and geue. *Id enim Sacrificium successit omnibus illis Sacrificijs veteris Testamenti, quae immolabantur in umbra futuri.* For that

Augu. De  
ciuitate Dei  
lib. 17. ca.  
29.

that Sacrifice (saith he) hath succeeded al those Sacrifices of the old Testament, which were offered in the shadow of that to come.

Wherefore this Sacrifice being the body of those shadowes, must excel in substance the Sacrifices, that were the shadowes. But how can that be, if the substance of bread be the substance of our Sacrifice, for as much as the substance of bread is no better (if it be so good being an artificial and dead thing) then is the substance of a lambe, an Oxe, or a goat, which are natural, and lyuing creatures, whose substances were substances of the olde Sacrifices, that were shadowes.

S. Alexander therefore the fourth Bishhop of Rome after S. Peter, considering the excellency of our Sacrifice about the olde Sacrifices, saith, *Nihil in Sacrificiis maius esse potest, quam corpus & sanguis Christi, nec ulla oblatio hac patior est, sed omnes hac praeclit, &c.* Nothing can be greater in Sacrifices, then the body and bloude Christe, neither is there any oblation better then this, but this doth farre excel al others, the which ought to be offered vp vnto God with a cleane conscience, and to be receiued with a pure mynde, and of men to be worshipped.

Alexand.  
epist. 1. De  
Cōsec. dist.  
2. cap. Nihil in.

Thus our Sacrifice comeyning really the pretious body and bloude of Christe, is a Sacrifice worthy of the newe Testamente, most meere and hable to represent vnto vs, and preserue in perpetual remembrance the same body and bloude rent and shed vpon the Crosse, and most effectual to deriue and apply vnto vs, the merites and fruites of that bloudy Sacrifice.

Augu. lib.  
2. quest.  
Euangel.  
cap. 3.  
VVhat  
properly  
is signi-  
fied by  
antitypō.

And yet neuer the lesse being ministred vnder the outward formes not of the body and bloude it selfe, but of bread and wine for our infirmities sake, and for the better practise of our faith: it is rightly called the sampler of the roial body of Christe; so termed by a fitte worde in the greke tongue, *antitypon*, which being taken in the best signification, (as it is reason it should so be taken, sich it signifieth a Sacrifice most diuine, and as S. Augustine termeth it, *Sacrificium Sanctum Sanctorum*, the Sacrifice that is of al holy things the most holy) doth import a true and like sampler, or counterpane equal in truth and worthinesse with that which is the ἀρχέτυπον, that is, the principal copie. For so much doth the greke preposition ἀντι signify in composition, as for example, Homere oftentimes calleth that man ἀντιθεον, as much to say, equable to God, who for some excellent qualitie seemed to be nothing inferiour (at least in that point) to them whom he seemed to be Gods. And in consideration hereof, learned men haue translated the Greke worde ἀντιτυπον, by this *Periphrasis* or circumlocution, *exemplar similis forma*, a sampler of like forme.

Now what thing is there any where, that is worthy to be, or may be a true patern or sampler of like forme to the body and blood of Christe crucified and shed, and now remaining visibly in heauen, but the body and blood of Christe him selfe, which by vertue of his almighty woordes, he of his singular mercie so maketh and tempereth for vs in the most holy mysteries, geuing them vs vnder the formes of our common foode breade and wine, that neither the Maiestie of them should deterre and fray vs from offering them, nor any lothsomnes,  
or sight

or fight of fleshe and bloude, shoulde cause vs to abhorre to eate and drinke them. And thus the body of Christ in the Eucharist, is, *anti typon*, that is to say, a signe, a sacrament, a patern, a sampler of his body that hoong vpon the Crosse, and of his body that is now in Maiestie at the right hande of God the Father.

Neither is this a new doctrine of our deuise, it was taught in Christes Church aboute eleuen hundred yeres past. Let these woordes of S. Augustine serue to witnesse the same.

*Caro eius est, quam forma panis operam in Sacramento accipimus, & sanguis eius, quem sub vini specie & sapore potamus: Caro videlicet carnis, & sanguis est Sacramentum Sanguinis, utroque inuisibili, Spirituali, intelligibili, signatur visibile Domini nostri Iesu Christi corpus & palpabile, plenum gratia omnium virtutum, & diuina Maiestate.* The flesh of Christe it is, that being couered with the forme of bread we receiue in the Sacrament, and his blood it is, which vnder the shape and sauour of wine we drinke: soothly flesh is a sacrament of flesh, and bloude a sacrament of bloude, by both being inuisible, spiritual, and intelligible, the body of Iesus Christe our Lord that is visible and palpable, ful of the grace of al vertues, and diuine Maiesty, is betokened.

*Augu. lib. Sentent. Prosperi. de Consec. Dist. 2. Hoc est.*

Consider this doctrine wel Christian Reader. First, that whiche we receiue in the Sacrament vnder the formes of bread and wine (S. Augustine telleth thee) is the flesh and bloude of Christe. Next, he saith, not that the outward formes of bread and wine, but that the very flesh and bloude, be sacramentes of flesh and bloude. Lastly, to put al doubt away, and to make the mater cleare, he sheweth how this is true, and saith, that



by both flesh and bloude inuisible, and intelligible, the visible and palpable body of Christe is pointed to, notified, and signified. Which is as much to say briefly, as that the body of Christe in the Sacrament inuisible, is a signe or sampler of Christes body visible. Al this yf thou consider diligently and aduisedly, thou maist easily vnderstande, what both S. Clement in the place by M. Iewel alleged, and other learned Fathers meane by this worde, *antitypon*, in the mater of the blessed Sacrament: soothly not to exclude the real presence of Christes body, but to signifie the secret meane of the presence.

We graunt therefore the Sacrament of the Aulter to be a signe, as S. Clement calleth it, *antitypō*. But when by any Sacramentarie the denial of the thing it self is inferred of the affirmation of the signe, we deny the Argument. For there be two kindes of signes. One is significative onely, the other exhibitue, which doth not only betoken or signifie, but also exhibiteth, and geueth the thing signified. In the olde Lawe the vnleuened bread signified onely, that the feast of Easter was to be celebrated with sinceritie of harte and life. The corporal purgations signified onely the cleansing of myndes. But Baptisme in the newe Lawe doth not onely signifie, but also exhibiteth, and worketh the Washing of synnes, and is the ablution it selfe, or washing away of sinnes. Likewise the holy Euchariste doth not onely betoken or signifie, the body and bloud of Christe, but contineth, and exhibiteth it present, and is the very body and bloude of Christ, it is *signū signatū, & exhibitū*. Thus it appeareth, how the Sacramentaries Argument is naught, The Sacrament is a signe, *ergo* it is not the body. For it is both a  
signe

The kindes of Signes, significative only, and exhibitue.

*Signū signatū, & exhibitū*



signe, and the body it selfe. For if any wil say, it is a signe significatiue only, it is to be denied as false, and contrary to the manifest wordes of Scripture, and the expositions of al the Fathers.

Now I reporte me to the iudgement of the discrete Reader, what aduauntage M. Iewel hath gotten by the terme, *antitypon*, alleged out of S. Clement against the blessed Sacrifice of the Church. On the other side, what aduauntage may iustly be taken against him, for that most falsly he hath corrupted his author? For looke Reader vpon the shorte testimonie which he allegeth out of S. Clement, and thou shal finde, that M. Iewel hath cut out of the midst, two wordes of greatest force for the vnderstanding of that goeth there immediatly before: that by falshod he might geue at least some colour vnto his Reply, where in truth he had none at all.

S. Clemēt  
corrupte  
ted by M.  
Iewel.

The wordes falsly cut away be these, *acceptabilem q̃*. *Eucharistiam*. So that the whole sentence is this in S. Clement, *Antitypum regalis corporis Christi, acceptabilem q̃, Eucharistiam offerre in Ecclesiis & cæmeteriis vestris*. Offer ye vp the sampler of the roial body of Christ, and the acceptable Euchariste in your Churches, and burying places.

Clemen.  
Constitut.  
lib. 6. cap.  
30.

These two wordes with the sleight of falsifying nipte away by M. Iewel, be so requisite to the vnderstanding of the authours meaning, that without them mater of cauil by reason of the terme, *antitypon*, may be ministered vnto such, as be more ready to impugne, then to defend the doctrine of the vniuersal Church touching the substance of the Sacrament, and Sacrifice of the Altar. Contrarywise being least in the sentence, considered, and rightly vnderstanded, they exclude al occasion of doubte.

of doubt or cauil; that might rise through the other terme of more obscuritie. For the Euchariste without doubt in that age being taken for the body of Christ, how can it be conceiued, that the other terme, *antitypon*, in the same place ioyned by a copulatiue together with it, should importe the contrary?

That S. Clement meant by the Eucharist the true and real body of Christe, it is euident by that we finde in the learned Fathers of that age, namely S. Ignatius, and S. Ireneus, who lyued in, or sone after S. Clementes tyme.

Ireneus  
lib. 4. ca.  
34.

S. *Ireneus* saith, that the breade hauing receiued the calling vpon of the name of God (whereby he meaneth the Consecration) is no more common bread, but *Eucharistia ex duabus rebus constans, terrena, & caelesti, the Euchariste consisting of two thinges, the one earthly* (whereby he vnderstandeth the forme of bread) *the other heavenly* (which is the body of our Sauour). And that it ap-

The Euchariste  
maketh  
our bodies  
to be  
immortal.

peare certainly, that he thought the Euchariste to be the body and bloude of Christe, he proueth that our bodies shal not remaine in corruption, but haue the resurrection that is hoped for, *bicause they receiue the Euchariste, and be fed with the flesh and bloude of our Lorde.*

Ignat. ad  
Smyrnen.

S. Ignatius likewise in an Epistle *ad Smyrnenfes*, as *apud Theodoritum* allegeth him in the third booke of his *Dia-*

dorit. li. 3.

logues writing against certaine Heretikes, that would haue neither Euchariste, nor Sacrifice: auoucheth the Eucharist to be the flesh of Christe. These be his wordes,

Dialog.

The Euchariste is  
the flesh  
of Christ,  
that suffe-  
red for  
vs.

*Eucharistias & oblationes non admittunt, eo quod non confiteantur Eucharistia esse carnem seruatoris nostri Iesu Christi, quae pro peccatis nostris passa est, & quam Pater sua benignitate suscitauit.* Eucharistes and oblations they wil not ad-

mit,

mit, because they wil not confesse the Euchariste to be the flesh of our Sauour Iesus Christe, which flesh suffered for our sinnes, and which the Father of his goodnes raised vp from death.

Marke Reader, this auncient Father and blessed Martyr saith not, the Euchariste signifieth Christes flesh, but is Christes flesh, yea that flesh, which was crucified, buried, and rose againe.

And although *Theodoritus* alleged this authoritie to proue, that it was the humaine flesh, and not the Godhead of Christe, that suffered death, and rose againe, which he proueth by the later parte of the same: yet it principally proueth our purpose, that the Euchariste is the true flesh of Christe. Againe onlesse the selfe same flesh of Christe be in the Euchariste, which died vpon the Crosse, and rose againe: this authoritie auailed *Theodoritus* nothing to proue, that Christes flesh was crucified, and raised vp againe.

Wherefore for so much as it is cleare by the testimonies of *S. Ignatius*, and *S. Irenaeus*, who liued not long after *S. Clements* time, that the beleefe of their age was, the Euchariste to be the flesh and bloude of Christe: how can M. Iewel kepe his credite with any man that loueth truth, and not seme to haue intended crafte and deceite, in that of purpose, least the truth should appeare manifest, he falsified his auctor by clipping away those two wordes from the middest of the sentence, that make directly against him, and put away al doubte of contrary sense? Thus to mainteine the false doctrine of his arrogant Challenge, he feareth not to violate the Fathers, to corrupte their writings, to deceiue the worlde, to pur-

chafe him selfe the most reprocheful name of a falsifier. By such champions such quarrels are mainteined.

Constitut.  
lib. 8.

As for the other place of S. Clement, where he saith, *offerimus hunc panem, & hoc poculum*, we offer this breade, and this cuppe: who nowe a daies knoweth not that the Sacrament sometimes is called by the name of breade and wine, not bicause the substance of breade and wine remaineth: but bicause the outwarde formes, tast, and other qualities of breade and wine be sene, felt, and perceiued: bicause before consecration it was breade and wine, and bicause it is the true breade and wine, that came downe from heauen. Neither doth S. Clement (which is to be noted) barely cal it bread and a cuppe, but *this bread, and this Cuppe*, as S. Paule calleth it likewise, *this bread, and this Cuppe*, and *that bread*, and *the Cuppe of our Lorde*. By which manner of speach vttered with the Pronoun Demonstratiue, not common bread, nor a common cuppe, but a singlar, a diuine, a heauenly, and the super substantial breade, and the like cuppe in Saint Clement is signified: euen that breade and cuppe, which according to Christes Institution was before consecrated with the woordes of our

This  
breade,  
this Cup.  
1. Cor. 11.

Math. 26.  
Luk. 22.

Lorde, *This is my body, This is my bloude.*

Jewel.

Neither did Christe by these vwordes, Doo ye this in my Remembrance, erecte any newe Succession of Sacrificers, to offer him vp Really vnto his Father: nor euer did any Auncient learned Father so expounde it. Christes meaning is cleare by the vwordes, that folow. For he saith not onely, Doo ye this, but he addeth also, In my Remembrance: VWhich Doings pertaineth, not only vnto the Apostles,

and

and their successors, as M. Harding imagineth, but also to the whole people. And therefore S. Paule saith, not only to the Ministers, but also to the whole Congregation of Corinth, As often, as ye shal eate this Bread, and drinke this Cuppe, Ye shal shewe foorth, and publishe the Lordes Deathe, vntil he come. Likewise S. Chrysostome applieth the same, not onely to the Clerergie, but also to the whole people of his Church of Antioche. Thus he saith, Hoc facite in memoriam Beneficij mei, Salutis vestrae: Doo ye this in Remembrance of my Benefite, and of your Saluation.

1. Cor. 11.

Chrysost.  
ad popul.  
Antioch.  
Homil. 62.

Of these weeke positions M. Harding without the warrante, or authoritie of any learned Father reasoneth thus: Christe saith, This is my Bodie, that is geuen for you: Doo this in my Remembrance:

Ergo, The Priesthe hath power to offer vp the Sonne of God vnto his Father.

Harding.

What M. Jewel meaneth by erecting a newe succession of Sacrificers, I know not, but that he taketh pleasure in his owne skoffing wittte. And whereas he was not hable with sounde reasons, or good authorities to impugne the Priesthod of the new Testament, it liked him to worke his spite against it with scorneful, prophane, and I ewish vtterance.

Priestes  
nowe  
made by  
election,  
and ordi-  
natio, and  
continew  
not by  
right of  
successio.

Who euer said, that Christe by those wordes, erected a new succession of Sacrificers? If no man euer said it, why chargeth he vs, as though it had bene said? Aarons Priesthode went by succession, and belonged to one Tribe: But Priestes of the newe Testamente enter not into their Priesthod by right of succession, as they of the Leuitical Tribe did: but by election, and lawful ordination.

Y ij

This



This Priesthod principally is Christes, which continueth without succession for euer, as he is a Priest for euer after the order of Melchisedek. Neither be we that are Priestes the Successours of Christe, and much lesse of Aaron: we be the ministers of Christ in the function of this Priesthod, and that which we do, we do it by vertue and power of Christe, and in the person of Christ: yea rather Christ is said to doo it through vs. For *Oecumenius* speaking of the daily execution of our Priesthooode, and of Priestes that daily do sacrifice, saith, *per quos medios Christus sacrificat, & sacrificatur*, Christe by the meanes or mediation of the Priestes that be now (of whom there he spake before) sacrificeth, and is sacrificed.

*Euseb. De Demonst. lib. 5.* Eusebius declaring the euerlasting priesthod of Christ after the order of Melchisedek, saith likewise. *Et sanè oraculi exitus admirabilis est ei, qui contempletur, quomodo Seruator noster Iesus, Christus Dei, ipsius Melchisedech ritum, ea qua sunt Sacrificij inter homines faciendi, etiam adhuc per suos ministros perficiat.* And verily the accomplishment of the oracle (which is, *thou art a Priest for euer after the order of Melchisedek*) is maruelous to him that beholdeth, how our Sauour Iesus, the Christ of God, doth performe euen vntil this day, those things that be of the Sacrifice, which is to be done amonge men.

Marke Reader, how is that accomplished, which the Father in the Psalme is reported to haue said vnto Christ, *Thou art a Priest for euer after the order of Melchisedech*. How remaineth he a Priest for euer, sith cōcerning that Oblation and sacrifice, which was once offered by him (saith *Oecumenius*, meaning the sacrifice of the Crosse) he would

would not haue said, *in aeternum* for euer? To this question that might be moued, both *Occumenius*, and *Eusebius* do answer: that euen now Christe doth the thinges that belong vnto the Sacrifice, which is to be made among men. Which is asmuch in sense, as *Occumenius* saith, that now by the mediation of Priestes ministerie, Christe sacrificeth, and is sacrificed. And so he remaineth a Priest for euer.

But leauing these skorneful termes of erecting a newe succession of Sacrificers, to the schoole of Heretiques, and vsing the common wordes of the Church, If M. Iewel meane therby to say, that Christe speaking these wordes, *Do ye this in my remembrance*, did not ordeine the Apostles Priestes, nor therby gaue them auctoritie to ordeine others, that for tyme to come should succede them in that order, and that so saying he gaue not them power, auctoritie, and comission to offer vp his body and bloud: I say his meaning is vtterly vntrue. And this also, which he saith further, that neuer any learned Father so expounded those wordes of Christe, I affirme to be very false, as here it shal appeare.

First let S. Clement be heard in this point, whom M. Iewel in a false cause doth here take holde of. Bicause the place is somewhat longe, it shalbe sufficient to re-  
 porte it in English truly translated. Thus he saith. *Of*  
*Moyse most derely beloued of God, were instituted Bishops,*  
*Priestres, and Levites. Of our Saviour we thirreen Apostles.*  
*Of the Apostles, I Iames, and I Clement, and with vs others,*  
*that we reckon not at againe. Comonly of al vs, Priestres, Dea-*  
*cons, Subdeacons, and Readers. The first high Bishop then by*  
*nature is Christe the only begottē, who caught not honour vn-*

That  
 Christe  
 made the  
 Apostles  
 Priestes.  
 Clemens  
 Constitur.  
 Aposto. li.  
 8. cap. vlt.

I iij to him

to him selfe, but was constituted of his Father. Who for our sake being made man, and offering spiritual sacrifice to God and his Father, before his passion commaunded vs alone, to do the same thing, albeit others were present with vs. that beleued in him. But yet not euery one that beleneth is by and by a Priest, and promoted vnto Bishoply honour.

This testimonie of S. Clement declareth plainely, both that Christe made the Apostles Priestes, before his Passion geuing charge and commaundement to them onely, though others that beleued were present, to doo and make the thing, which he had done, that is to say, to take bread and wine, to geue thankes, to blesse, to breake the bread, and to say in the person of Christe, *this is my Body, this is my Bloude, &c.* Which he calleth offering of spiritual sacrifice, bicause that body and bloud of Christe are thus offered vp spiritually, and in a Mysterie without bloudshed: And also that the Apostles afterward instituted Priestes, Deacons, Subdeacons, and Readers.

Chrysost.  
in Litur-  
gia.

S. Chrysostom excusing him selfe for that he presumed to minister vnto Christe at his holy table, and gathering boldnesse of that Christe him selfe had commaunded it, saith: *Sacrificiorum ritum instituisti, ac solennis huius & immaculati Sacrificij celebrationem nobis tradidisti, tanquam Dominus omnium.* Thou (Christe) hast instituted the rite of sacrificing, and hast deliuered vnto vs the celebration of this solemne and unspeotted Sacrifice, as Lord of al. And afterward he saith moreouer, hauing rehearsed what Christ did and said at the Supper, *memoriam igitur agentes salutaris huius mandati*, we kepe the memorie of this healthful commaundement, meaning the commaundement

dement geuen by these wordes, *Doo ye this in my Remembrance.* Luc. 22.

When S. Chrysostome saith, *Christ deliuered the celebration of this Sacrifice vnto vs*, it is to be considered, vnto which vs, and when he did deliuer it. S. Chrysostome was a Bishop, and therefore a Priest: so then naming vs, he meant Priestes. The time when it was deliuered, was at his last Supper. For the Scripture geueth no occasion to thinke, that Christ leaste to Priestes the celebratiō of this Sacrifice any where els, but where he said vnto his Apostles: *Doo ye this in my remembrance.* Luc. 22. 1. Cor. 11.

S. Dionysē the Areopagite S. Pauls scholer, doth acknowledge, and in most plaine wordes confesse, that Christe by these woordes gaue commaundement to Priestes to offer vp this diuine Sacrifice. Thus he saith.

*Quocirca Antistes reuerenter & ex Pontificali officio, post sacras diuinorum operum Laudes; quod hostiam saluarem, qua supra ipsum est, litet, se excusat, ad ipsum primò decenter exclamans, Tu dixisti, hoc facite in mei commemorationem.* Dionys. in Ecclesiast. Hierarch. Part. 3 c. 3.

The Bishop therefore, after he hath praised the workes of God, excuseth him selfe reuerently, and according to his Bishoply office, for that he sacrificeth the heathful hoste, which is aboue his worthinesse, semely first crying vnto him, Thou (ō Christ) hast said, *Doo ye this in my remembrance.*

Thus it appeareth clearly by this auncient Bishop, and blessed Martyr, who is to be thought to haue learned the same of S. Paule him self, as also by sundry other Fathers, of whome some be already alleged, some hereafter. shal be alleged: that Christe by these woordes, *Doo ye this in my remembrance*, gaue to Priestes auctoritie and commission to offer vp the healthful Sacrifice, which can be

none

none other but that of his body and bloude: and that by the same wordes they vnderstode them selues both charged so to doo, and also excused of presumption in doing, the doing of it being a thing, that so farre passeth the worthinesse of humaine condition.

But M. Iewel to put away wholly the Sacrifice, whereas Christe said, *doe ye this in my remembrance*, saith very strangely and boldly, that *this doing pertaineth not only vnto the Apostles, and their successours, but also vnto the whole people*. And he beareth the worlde in hande, that this is the cleare meaning of Christe, bicause of these wordes, *in my remembrance*. As though bicause that heauenly Sacrifice is to be offered in remembrance of Christe, therefore the common people and euery one of them should haue the handling of the diuine Mysteries, and be made the Ministers of them.

M. Iewel  
vould, al  
the peo  
ple to be  
Ministers  
of the Sa  
crifice.

If this be true, weemen haue much wrong, among whom in so many hundred yeres, as haue ben since Christ gaue this commaundement, none was yet euer admitted vnto that administration. And if it pertaine vnto the whole people (as M. Iewel saith) why should weemen be excluded? In dede it were a great ease for these holy Ministers, that their good wiues ministred sometimes in the Cōgregations for them, whiles they be playing with their children, or keeling the potte at home.

He should haue done wel, to haue proued this strange point, more substantially, sith thereby he should do great pleasure to his fellow Ministers, to many other good felowes, and specially to many good sad dames of his owne Gospel, whose curiositie would be wel pleased, if they were admitted to minister, and to doo so much, as these



these wordes of Christe doo importe, *doo ye this in my remembrance*. The deuill hauing sowed hatred in M. Iewels breste against the priesthod, and Sacrifice of the newe Testament, hath brought him vnto this fowle absurditie.

Peraduenture to auoide so great an inconuenience, he wil say, that these wordes doo principally pertain vnto the Ministers, who haue succeded the Apostles in this ministerie, and secondarily vnto the faithful people. If he say so, let him withal consider, that being so vnderstanded they may wel serue for the Apostles to claime vnto them selues the auctoritie of Priesthod, to offer vp the Sacrifice, and also to ordeine priestes to succede them. For as touching the office of a Priest, it is a cōfessed truth, that the Priest in offering the body and bloud of Christ, is the principal agent concerning outward ministerie, and as it were the instrument of the people, which by a certaine meane offereth also, geuing vnto the Priestes action their assent, and applying their deuotion. Much like to that we say of a multitude to make a supplication, when one man is the speaker and chiefe doer, and the reste only geue their consent to that is said and done.

And what though S. Paule say vnto the Corinthians, *1. Cor. xi.*

*As often as ye shall eat this bread, and drinke this Cuppe, ye shall shewe forth our Lordes death, vntil he come?* wil it folow thereof, that Christe speaking these wordes, *doo ye this in my remembrance*, woulde the whole people to doo that he at his supper did? That is to say, that euery lay person, boye, and woman (for they be of the number of the people) shal take bread, blesse and geue thanks, and vtter the wordes of consecration; *This is my body*, and likewise the cuppe, saying; *this is my bloude, &c?*

Z

Doth

Doth he not vnderstand, there is great difference betwen this commaundement of Christ, and that saying of S. Paule? betwen, *doo this in my remembrance*, which Christe saith: and, *when so euer ye eate this bread, and drinke this cuppe, ye shew forth our Lordes death*, whiche S. Paule saith? Seeth he not the one to belong vnto the Priest, as he is the pronuncer of the Diuine wordes, whereby the holy Euchariste is consecrate and made: the other to be referred vnto them, that receiue it after it is consecrate? And though both tende to one ende, that is, to celebrate the memorie of Christes death, yet be not the actions diuers? and may they not be done by diuers persons, as it happeth when the people receiue the body of Christe at the priestes handes?

This much may serue also for answer to the autoritie brought out of S. Chrysostome. For the circumstance of the place declareth euidently, that he spake there of the peoples receiuing of the mysteries. And so in that place, *facere* signifieth onely to receiue, and not to consecrate and minister the Sacrament.

M. Iew.  
corrupteth S.  
Chrysostome.

Chrysost.  
hom. 61.  
ad Pop.  
Antioch.

And here M. Iewel, least he should not be alwaies like vnto him selfe, altereth and changeth his authours wordes, and maketh S. Chrysostomes wordes to sounde to the aduantage of his owne false purpose. For whereas S. Chrysostome saith thus, *Quotiescunque hoc feceritis, mortem Domini annuntiabitis, hoc est, facietis commemorationem salutis vestrae beneficij mei*: As often as ye shal do this, ye shal set forth our Lordes death, that is to say, ye shal make a commemoration of your saluation being my benefite: M. Iewel allegeth him thus. *Hoc facite in memoriam beneficij mei salutis vestrae. Doo ye this in remembrance of my*

of my benefite, and of your saluation. Wherein he falsifieth the Doctōr, maketh a false translation of the place, and geueth out a sence contrary to S. Chrxlostomes meaning. Such aduenturing to alter Modes, and Tenses, to tel an other tale, then the Doctōr alleged telleth, to leaue out, to put in wordes of priuate forgerie, is a most certaine argument of vntrue dealing, and of guile intended of M. Iewels parte.

The 5. Diuision.

The Answer.

**T**Hat Christe offered him selfe to his Father in his last Supper, and that Priestes by those woordes, Doo this in my remēbraunce, haue not onely auctoritie, but also a special commaundement to doo the same, and that the Figure of Melchisedech, and the Prophecie of Malachie pertaineth to this Sacrifice, and maketh proufe of the same: let vs see by the testimonies of the Fathers, what doctrine th' Apostles haue left to y<sup>e</sup> Church.

Eusebius Cesariensis hath these woordes, *Horro-* *Euseb. lib. 1  
de demō-  
strat.*  
*rem afferentia Mensæ Chrilti Sacrificia Supre-*  
*mo Deo offerre, per eminentissimum omnium*  
*ipsius Pontificem edocti sumus. We are taught*  
*(saith he) to offer vnto our Supreme God the Sacrifices*  
*of Christes Table, which cause vs to tremble, and quake*  
*for feare, by his Bishop highest of al. Here he calleth*  
*Christe in respect of his Sacrifice, Gods Bishop high-*  
*est of al Bishoppes: the Sacrifices of Christes Table he*  

*Z ij*

*calleth,*

callethe, the Bodie and Bloude of Chriſte, bicauſe at the Table in his laſt Supper he Sacrificed and offered the ſame, and for that it is his very Bodie, and his very Bloude, imagination onely, Phantaſie, and Figure ſet aparte, he termeth theſe Sacrifices, as commonly the auncient Fathers doo, horrible, cauſing trembling and feare. And whereas he ſaith, we haue bene taught to offer theſe Sacrifices to God, doubtleſſe he meaneth by theſe woordes of Chriſte: Doo this in my remembrance, This is my Bodie, which is geuen for you: This is my Bloude, which is ſhedde for you. Clement in his eight Booke often cited, ſpeaking of the Sacrifice offered by the Apoſtles, commonly addeth theſe woordes, Secundum ipſius ordinationem, or, ipſo ordinante: whereby he confeſſeth it to be Chriſtes owne ordinance.

## Jewel.

To proue, that the Priſt offereth up the Sonne of God, M. Hardinge hath here brought in Eusebius an Ancient Father, that neuer once named any ſuche Oblation of the Sonne of God. So much is he oppreſt, and encombred vvith his ſtoare.

True it is, The Miniſtration of the Holy Communion is oftentimes of the olde learned Fathers called a Sacrifice: not for that, they thought, the Priſte had Authoritie, to Sacrifice the Sonne of God, but for that therein vvwe offer up vnto God, Thanks, and Praises for that greate Sacrifice once made vpon the Croſſe. So ſaith S. Auguſtine, In iſto Sacrificio eſt gratiarum actio, & Commemoratio Carnis Chriſti, quam pro nobis obtulit. In this Sacrifice is a Thanks geuinge and

Auguſt. ad  
Petrũ Di-  
aco. ca. 19.

and a remembrance of the flesh of Christe, whiche he hath offered for vs. *Likevvise Eusebius saith*, Christe after al other things donne, made a marueilous Oblation, and a passinge Sacrifice vnto his Father (*upon his Crosse*) for the Saluation of vs al: geuinge vnto vs to offer continually vnto God a Remembrance in steede of a Sacrifice. So Nazianzenus calleth the Holy Communion, A Figure of that great Mysterie, of the Deathe of Christe.

This is it, that Eusebius calleth, The Sacrifice of the Lordes Table: Whiche also he calleth, Sacrificium Laudis, The Sacrifice of Praise.

Harding.

Euseb. De  
demonstr.  
li. i. c. 10.  
Nazian.  
in Apolog.  
τὴν τῶν  
μεσάλλων  
μυστηρίων  
ἀγίτου-  
πον. τὴν  
θυσίαν  
ἀνέσχεως.

M. Iewels Replye in this Diuision is of smal pith and substance. Least he should seme to say nothing, whereas in deede he hath nothing to say, whereby clearely to auoide the force of Eusebius authoritie by me alleged: he darkeneth the mater with many wordes partly of his owne, partly of other Doctours to litle purpose rehersed.

The effect of his whole tale consisteth in these .4. pointes.

First, he denieth that Eusebius euer named any such Sacrifice of the Sonne of God vnto his Father.

Secondly, he adknowlegeth the Ministracion of the holy Communion (for so he calleth it) of the olde learned Fathers to be called a Sacrifice, bicause of thanks, and praises therein offered vnto God.

Thirdly, he alloweth not the Argumente made out of Eusebius for proufe that Christe is offered vnto his Father.

Fourthly, he pretendeth to shewe causes, why the Sacrifice of the Communion is dredful, and causeth the



harte to tremble.

M. Iewell  
is driuen  
from the  
mater, vn  
to precise  
vvordes.

Touching the first, what meane you M. Iewel by saying, that Eusebius neuer once named any suche oblation of the Sonne of God? Be you so addicted to the precise termes of your own Challenge, that other wordes of equal force may not be admitted? Verely this declareth the weaknesse of your cause, and openeth your poore shifte to the worlde, which is, that whereas you are conuicte by cleare truth of thinges, yet you runne for succour vnto the shadowe of wordes.

You denye by the wordes of your Challenge, that by witnesse of any doctor within the first six hundred yeres after Christe, we are hable to shewe, that a Priest hath auctoritie to offer vp Christe vnto his Father. Now this are we hable to proue as by diuers others, so in this place by testimonie of Eusebius, though expressly he name it not an oblation of the Sonne of God.

And forasmuch as you stand vpon your owne precise termes, you shalbe driuen from your holde by a precise Argument. Answer it, if you can. What so euer we that are Priestes haue ben taught by Christe to doo, to doo the same we haue auctoritie. But we haue ben taught by Christe to offer vp Christe vnto his Father: *Ergo*, to offer vp Christe vnto his Father we haue auctoritie. *Ergo*, the Priest hath auctoritie, &c.

Deus dicit  
Spiritus  
Euseb. de  
Demost.  
Euag. lib. 11.

The *Minor* or second proposition of this Syllogisme, you denye, I doubt not. For nought els with reason is here to be stickt at. That proposition then thus I proue by Eusebius, whom I alleged in my Answer. *We haue ben taught (saith he) to offer vp vnto our Supreme God the dreadfull Sacrifices of Christes table, by his Bishop highest of al.* Where-

Whereat doo you cauill? The proposition that you denye, and we affirme, being this, *The Priest hath auctoritie to offer up Christe vnto his Father*: what lacketh here, that answereth not the purport of your owne precise termes? *We haue ben taught by Gods bishop highest of al*, saith Eusebius, *Ergo*, The Priest hath auctoritie. Require you the worde, *to offer*? Beholde here it is put expressly, προσφέρειν .i. *offerre*. Cal you for the name of the Father? Looke in Eusebius, and you shal finde, *ὅς ἐστι πάντων θεός*, as much to say, *vnto God that is ouer al*. there haue you the Father of Christe plainly yenough expressed, onlesse you denie that the Father of Iesus Christe is God ouer al. How be it we acknowledge this sacrifice to be offered not only vnto the Father, but also vnto the Sonne, in as much as he is God, and vnto the holy Ghoste. Now for *Christe*, you haue here expressed, *the dreadful or honorable Sacrifices of Christes table*.

But you wil say. I heare the dreadful sacrifices of Christes table, but Christe him selfe, I heare not. Truth it is, Christe him selfe to be offered you heare not in expresse termes, but those termes, which to our vnderstanding do import Christes body and bloud, you heare, and therefore Christ him selfe, bicause of the vniō of both persons. For what other thing may we with any reason vnderstand by the dreadful Sacrifices of Christes table, but the body and bloude of Christe? What cause had Eusebius to make mention of Christes table, but to put vs in mynd of that table, wherevpon Christe at his last Supper consecrated and offered his pretious body and bloud, saying, *this is my bodie which is geuen for you, this is my bloude which*

Math. 26.

Luca 22.

1, Cor. 11.

*whiche is shed for you, as the Scripture teacheth vs?*  
**Cyprian.** Wherevpon the bread, that Christe gaue vnto his disci-  
*de cana* ples, changed not in shape, but in nature, by the omnipotencie  
**Domini.** of the worde is made flesh, as S. Cyprian writeth. Where-  
vpon is laid the lambe of God, that taketh away the sinnes  
**Concil.** of the worlde, as we finde it reported by the Fathers of  
**Nicen.** the first Nicen Councel. Wherevpon the voves of the  
**Optatus.** people, and the members of Christ be borne, as the Ancient  
*lib. 6.* Father Optatus speaketh. From whence our flesh is nour-  
**Iren. lib. 5** rished with the bloude and body of Christe, as S. Ireneus  
**Chrysost.** saith. From whence Christe hath geuen vs his flesh to sit vs  
*in 1. Cor.* withal, as S. Chrysostome preacheth.

**Hom. 24.** But M. Iewel vnderstandeth by the Sacrifices of  
Christes table spoken of in Eusebius, the Sacrifice of  
thankes geuing. For whereas I say in my Answer, that  
the Body and bloude of Christe, are called of Eusebius  
the Sacrifices of Christes table, bicause at the table in his  
last Supper he sacrificed and offered the same: he con-  
trolleth me for so saying, and skoreth it vp in the mar-  
gent for his: 222. Vntruth, shewing this cause why. For  
**M. Iewell** (saith he) *Eusebius calleth it the sacrifice of thankes geuing.*  
*belveth* wherein he deserueth an vntruth, or rather a manifest lie  
**Eusebius.** to be scored vp vpon him selfe. For neither nameth Eu-  
sebius a sacrifice in that place, which he would, if he had  
meant the sacrifice of thankes geuing, but sacrifices in  
the plural number, yea expressely the dreadful or hono-  
rable Sacrifices of Christes table, neither nameth he  
there expressely, the sacrifice of thankes geuing at al: And  
neuer was it heard before, that any olde, or late lear-  
ned catholike writer called thankes geuing indefinitely,  
the dreadful Sacrifices of Christes table. For to geue  
thankes

thanks it is not dredful, neither is it peculiar to the my-  
stical table, but common in respect of al times, places  
and seruices.

Certaine it is, as it shal be euident to al that wil peruse  
that place of Eusebius, that by the dreadful Sacrifices of  
Christes table, he meant the body and bloud of Christe:  
How be it he speaketh so thereof, vsing the termes, of  
memorie, signes, and tokens, as it was most conuenient  
for that time, when the Christians lyued among the Pai-  
nimes and Infidels, to whom those secretes were not to  
be reueled, accordingly as Christe forebad *a holy thing to*  
*be geuen to dogges, and precious stones to be caste before*  
*swyne.* By which way of vtterance the olde learned Fa-  
thers intent was, not to exclude the true presence of the  
most holy thinges, but to coouer them from the vnwor-  
thy Painimes prophane vnderstanding, and to insinuate  
vnto the beleuers, the mystical and secret manner of  
their presence.

Math. 7.

To returne to Eusebius, In the later parte of his first  
booke, *De demonstratione Euangelica*, discoursing vpon  
the excellencie of the newe Testament in comparison  
of the olde, hauing declared the figuratiue sacrifices of  
Moysees lawe to be abolished, and that lawe it selfe to  
haue his ende by the comming of Christe into flesh: at  
length he speaketh of three kindes of Sacrifices of the  
new Testamēt, prouinge ech one to haue ben forespoken  
of by the Prophetes. They are, the Sacrifice of the  
Crosse, the Sacrifice of the Aulter, and the mere spiri-  
tual Sacrifices.

Three  
kindes of  
Sacrifices  
of the  
new Tes-  
tament  
mencio-  
ned by  
Eusebius.  
Euseb. lib. 1.  
de demon-  
strat.

That which we cal the Sacrifice of the Crosse, he  
nameth, *the marvelous oblation, and passing Sacrifice, which*

AA

Christ

Christe offered vnto his Father for the saluation of vs al.

He termeth it also in respect of the thing sacrificed, the

\* ἐνσάρκω \* *fleshly presence of Christ, and his framed body*, that God fitted for him, alluding to the woordes of the Psalme, \* σὺ καὶ ἄρπ \* *Corpus aptasti mihi. thou (ô God) hast framed or fitted to me a bodye.*

That which of vs is commonly called the Sacrifice of the Aulter, he calleth, in respect of the action of offering; τούτου τοι θύμας & τὴν μνήμην ἐπὶ ἱερῶς ἐκτελεσμένην, &c. *The memorie of this Sacrifice (of the Crosse) celebrated vpon a table.* He calleth it also in respect of the thing offered, ὃ ἐνδοξόν, καὶ σεμνόν, καὶ ἱερόπρεπός θύμα. *The Diuine, honorable, and holy Sacrifice.* And terming it also *the pure Sacrifice*, alluding to the Prophecie of Malachie, he saith, that we sacrifice it, καινῶς κατὰ τὴν καινὴν διαθήκην, *after a new manner according to the new Testament.* Which can not be vnderstand of any other, then of the Sacrifices of the Aulter. Furthermore in respect of the body and bloude being two thinges that are offered, he calleth it, *the Sacrifices of Christes table*, as now the Church commonly calleth it the Sacrifice of the Aulter.

Touehing the third kinde of sacrifices, he nameth them first in general, by the terme, of *unbodyly and spiri- tual sacrifices*. Afterward particularly he calleth them, the sacrifice of praise, of praiers, of lifting vp the hâdes, of a contrite harte. The sacrifice of thanks geuing, by these very termes, he nameth not. In dede I confesse, that where he saith, *we sacrifice the memorie of the great Sacrifice* (meaning that of the Crosse) *celebrating it according to the mysteries deliuered vnto vs by Christe*: There he saith further, that we offer vp vnto God by godly hymnes



hymnes and prayers, *Eucharistiam pro salute nostra*, the Euchariste for our saluation: whiche peraduenture M. Iewel had rather to cal, *the thanks geuing for our saluation.*

την υπε  
ρωτερην  
ημων εν  
χαριστιαν

To shewe that the first and chiefe kinde of sacrifice was prophecied of in the time of the olde Testament, he allegeth the Prophete Dauid, saying: *Oblationem & sacrificium noluisti, corpus autem aptasti mihi.* Oblation and sacrifice thou refusedst, and had framed me a body.

Psal. 39.

For the sacrifices of the third kinde, he allegeth the knownen scriptures, *offer vnto God the sacrifice of praise, and render vnto the highest thy vowes, and cal vpon me in the day of tribulation, and I wil deliuer thee.* Againe, *The lifting vp of my handes is an euening sacrifice.* Item, *A contrite spirite is a sacrifice to God.* &c. In this order is to be placed the sacrifice of thanks geuing, which M. Iewel strangely and absurdly auoucheth to be that, whiche Eusebius calleth by the name of *the Sacrifices of Christes table.*

Psal. 49.

Psal. 140.

Psal. 50.

Now concerning the second kinde of Sacrifice, that Eusebius speaketh of, which is the sacrifice of th'Aulter, or as the termeth it, *the dreadful Sacrifices of Christes table:* whiles he allegeth the prophecies of Dauid, and of Esay for it, he sheweth clearely, that he meant not thereby the sacrifice of thanks principally, or praise for the Sacrifice once made vpon the Crosse, nor *the Ministration of the holy Communion*, of which M. Iewel confusely expoundeth Eusebius: but the holy Mysteries of Christes table, to wit, the Body and Bloude of Christe vnder the formes of bread and wine offered at the table in remembrance of Christes death. Which I confesse neuer the lesse alwaies to be offered not without the

The Sa  
crifices of  
Christes  
table,  
vvh  
at  
they are.

Sacrifice of thanks, and praise : and with that Sacrifice we doo thanke, and praise God most principally.

*Psal. 22.* The saying of Dauid prophecying of the Sacrifices of this table, as Eusebius allegeth, is this. *Paraſti in conſpectu meo menſam aduerſus eos qui tribulant me, Impinguasti in oleo caput meum, & calix tuus inebrians me quam fortissime.* Thou haſt prepared before mine eyes a table againſt thoſe that trouble me, thou haſt anointed my head with oile, and thy Cuppe maketh me dronke after a moſt ſtrōg wiſe. *Exprefſely and manifeſtly in theſe wordes (ſaith Eusebius) is ſignified the myſtical Chriſme (or ointment) and the dreadful (or honorable) Sacrifices of Chriſtes table.*

Verely this ſoueraigne praise, that Dauid after the mynde of Eusebius geueth vnto the myſtical Cuppe of our Lordes table, can not ſeme to be attributed vnto the Cuppe of the Sacramentarie Suppers, which containeth in it no better thing, then common wine. It is the bloud of Chriſte, not a ſuppe of common wine, that doth moiſt and inebriate a man in that moſt ſtrong wiſe, whereof Dauid prophecied. The Hebrew worde importing ſignification of great abundance, maketh much for this ſenſe, and quite contrary to the Sacramentarie doctrine.

From Dauid he goeth to Eſay the Prophete, alleging among other thinges a ſaying out of him, ſignifying, that *the Lorde of hoſtes ſhould do maruelous thinges in all nations.* What thoſe thinges are, the prophete declarereth. *They ſhal haue pleaſant drinke (ſaith he) they ſhal drinke wine. They ſhal be annointed with an ointment in this hil.* Vpon theſe wordes of Eſay thus ſaith Eusebius. *Theſe maruelous thinges that Eſay ſpeaketh of, did promiſe*

not to Israel, but to al nations, the annointing of a good sweete smelle, and of ointmētes, by reason whereof because of the annointing of the ointment, they obtained to be called Christians, (that is to say the annointed). Then folow the wordes, which declare what he meant by the Sacrifices of Christes table.

Furthermore (saith he) this prophete prophecieth vnto the Gentiles of the pleasantnes of wine, secretly signifying the Myserie of the new Testament of Christe, which is manifestly celebrated at this time among al nations. Thus Eusebius in that place expounding the prophecies of Dauid, and of Esay, promising the inebriating Cuppe, and giste of wine vnto the Gentiles, of the blessed Sacrifice of Christes table (which as it is called a table for that the heavenly foode is thence ministred vnto vs, so it is called also an Altar in respect of the oblation and Sacrifice there made and solemnized) doth plainly signifie what he vnderstode by the Sacrifices of Christes table, soothly not the sacrifice of thanks geuing principally, which semeth to the vnlearned to consist onely in wordes, but the Sacrifices of the body and bloude of Christe, and consequently Christe him selfe. And therefore that place of Eusebius is in my Answer to the Challenge rightly and aptly to my purpose alleged, as the whiche, proueth against M. Iewel, that the Priest hath auctoritie to offer vp Christe vnto his Father.

Yet if M. Iewel wil not cease to cal for his owne termes, not being content with termes equiualent: I thinke good to answer him, as S. Augustine answered Pascentius the Arian crying importunately for the terme *Homusio* to be shewed him in the Scriptures. *Quid est*

August.  
Epist. 174

AA ij contentio-

*contentiosus, quàm ubi de re constat, certare de nomine?* What is a more contentious parte, then to strue about the name, when the thing it selfe is certainly known.

But now M. Jewel bringeth in S. Augustine, Eusebius, and S. Gregorie Nazianzen, to witnesse with him, that *the ministration of the holy Communion* is called a Sacrifice, bicause therein thanks and Praises be offered vp vnto God for the Sacrifice made vpon the Crosse.

To this I answer, that these Fathers can not be shewed so much as once to haue named *the Sacrifice of the Ministration of the Communion*, nor that this *Ministration of the Communion* is in any of their workes expressly called a Sacrifice. He should haue done wel, if he had made it cleare, what he meaneth by *this holy Communion*, and what by the *Ministration of the same*. That the *Ministration of the Communion* is a Sacrifice, I trowe it is a speache neuer heard of in the Church of God, before these *Ministring prelates* came to teache vs a new faith.

The ministration of the new holy Communion made a new Sacrifice by M. Iew.

If he vnderstand by the *holy Communion*, the new deuise of the Calvinistes, which they haue set vp like an Idol in their defourmed churches in place of the blessed Masse, after a diuers manner in diuers Cities, and Countries, according to the diuers fantasies of new Ministers, who daily please them selues with changing what so euer liketh others, in which sorte of Communion there is no substance of any better thing, then of bread and wine, no due consecration made, no oblation, no real Sacrifice, no participation of the true body and bloude of Christe. If this be his meaning, as doubtlesse it is: most certaine it is, those auncient learned Fathers, neuer spake

spake of it, neuer knewe it : much lesse did they any where call the ministrati on of it, a Sacrifice.

S. Augustine saith not, *the ministrati on of the Communion is a Sacrifice*, which M. Iewel by his wordes taketh vpon him to proue : but, *In this Sacrifice* (saith he) *there is a thankesgeuing, and a cōmemorati on of the flesh of Christe, which he offered for vs, and of the bloude, which the same God did shed for vs. In this Sacrifice*, saith he, he saith not *in the ministrati on of the Cōmunion*. What he meant by this Sacrifice, there he sheweth clearely. For hauing said in the beginning of the chapter, that beastes were sacrificed vnto Christe with the Father, and the holy Ghost, by the Patriarkes, Prophetes, and Priestes of the olde Law, forthwith he addeth these wordes. *Cui nunc, id est, tempore Noui Testamēti, cū Patre & Spiritu sancto, cū quibus est illi vna Diuinitas, Sacrificiū Panis & vini in fide & charitate sancta Ecclesia Catholica, per vniuersum orbē terra offerre nō cessat.* Vnto whom now, that is to say, in the time of the Newe Testament, with the Father, and the Holy Ghoste, with whom he hath one Godhed, the holy Catholike Church doth not cease to offer vp through the whole worlde, the Sacrifice of bread and wine in faith and charitie.

M. Iewel thought to take aduantage of this place, because this Sacrifice is here called the sacrifice of bread and wine, and would nedes this to be taken for the ministrati on of his new Communion, as though because bread and wine is named (which is the substance of their cōmunion) the body and bloud of Christe were excluded. But this reason is very weake, besides that neither M. Iewel, nor any of the Caluinistes doo vse to call this sacrifice, the Sacrifice of bread and wine. Neither do they bring their

Augustin.  
ad Petrū  
Diaconū,  
cap. 19.

The Sac  
rifice of  
bread and  
wine.



their bread and wine to church to make a sacrifice of it to God, but to distribute it vnto their Congregations. The sacrifice they pretende to make, is of thanks and praises: any outward thing they sacrifice not at al.

True it is, this Sacrifice is sometimes called the Sacrifice of bread and wine, as in this place, *De Fide ad Petrum Diaconum*, either bicause it representeth in outward formes, bread and wine: or bicause bread and wine are the thinges, whereof the change it selfe, which pertaineth to the nature of a Sacrifice (for so much as it requireth, that the thing that is offered be sanctified by some change) taketh beginning. And as in the olde sacrifices of the Iewes, the Calfe both being yet alieue, was called a Sacrifice, bicause it was that thing, whiche by killing was to be sanctified, and also being killed, bicause it was the Hoste now sanctified by sacrificing, whiche hoste so many as did eate of, were made partakers of the aulter: Euen so in the Sacrament of the Euchariste, the bread and wine may be called a Sacrifice, as being the thinges, that by change made of them with consecration are to be sanctified. Therefore in the beginning of the Canon of the Masse it is said of them, *Supplices rogamus ac petimus, &c. We humbly pray and beseeche thee, that thou accepte, and blesse, these giftes, these presents, these holy Sacrifices.*

The body it selfe also, and bloud of Christe contained vnder the fourme of bread and wine, are called the Sacrifice, as being the thinges, into which the holy change by vertue of the wordes of Consecration is made. of which it is said in the end of the Canon: *We offer up vnto thy most honorable Maiestie of thy giftes and benefites,*

a pure

a pure Hoste, a holy Hoste, an vnspotted hoste. Thus we say, and so the Fathers speake both waies of this Sacrifice, that it is the Sacrifice of breade and wine, that is to say, made of bread and wine (bicause that which was breade and wine is now turned and changed into the body and bloude of Christe) and the Sacrifice of the body and bloude of our Lorde, that is to say, the very true hoste it selfe with a certaine diuine change consecrated and made.

In other places most commonly it is named of the Fathers, the Oblation or Sacrifice of the body and bloud of Christe, in consideration of the inward substance of the Sacrifice vnder the formes of bread and wine contained. As S. Augustine writing against *Faustus* the Heretique, hauing spoken of the manifold Sacrifices of the olde law, and of the Sacrifice of the Crosse, consequently saith, whereby he signifieth, what he vnderstandeth by this sacrifice of bread and wine: *Iam Christiani per acti eiusdem Sacrificij memoriam celebrant, sacrosancta oblatione, & participatione corporis & sanguinis Christi.* The Christians do nowe celebrate the memorie of the Sacrifice of the Crosse past and done, by the holy oblation, and participation of the body and bloude of Christe. So in diuers considerations both these sayinges be true, The holy catholike Church euey where offereth vp to God the sacrifice of bread and wine, and it offereth the Sacrifice of the flesh and bloud of Christe.

And v/hereas our daily Sacrifice, which the Christians doo now euey where offer, is the celebration of the memorie of that which was done vpon the Crosse, and therefore oftentimes of the Fathers is named a me-

BB

morie

Aug. contr.  
Faust. lib.  
20, ca. 18.

Euseb. in  
Demonst.  
lib. 1.  
Rom. 6.

memorie or commemoration, as we finde in Eusebius here also alleged by M. Iewel: the words *Memorie or commemoration* excludeth the truth of passion and death (for now Christe suffereth, nor dieth no more) the truth, or real presence of the body, which on the Crosse suffered and dyed for vs, it excludeth not. For with and by the holy Oblation and participation of that flesh and bloude (saith S. Augustine) we celebrate the memorie of the Sacrifice that was made vpon the Crosse. So that the substance of the Sacrifice of the Crosse, and of that of the Altar, is one and the same, the flesh and bloude of Christ: onely the manner of Oblation is diuers. Which if these Gospellers would once confesse, as S. Augustine here witnesseth, and Christes Church hath euer beleueed, and they them selues be not ignorant of: we should not haue neede to write so many bookes, and the worlde should sone drawe to a better quiet.

As for the two other testimonies alleged out of Eusebius, and S. Gregorie Nazianzen, they prooue not that for which they be alleged, which is, that the Ministration of the Communion is of them called a sacrifice, wherby M. Iewel would exclude the Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe. For first as touching Nazianzen, by what Logique maketh he this Argument good, He calleth the holy Communion, \* *exemplar magnorum Mysteriorum*, the Figure or sampler of the great Mysteries: Ergo, the Ministration of the Communion, is called a Sacrifice? Verily in this Argument is neither reason, nor good Logique.

What though Eusebius say thus being truly translated, *Christe after al (the Sacrifices of Moses Lawe) hauing sacrificed*

\* *κντιε*  
*τυπορ*.

*sacrificed a maruelous sacrifice, and a passing Hoste vnto his Father, offered it vp for al our saluatiō,\* hauing deliuered vnto vs also a memorie, to offer it vp continually vnto God \* for a Sacrifice, so it is to be translated, not in steede of a Sacrifice, as Maister Iewel hath turned it? Wil he conclude of this, that Eusebius calleth the Ministration of his Communion a Sacrifice? No, no, his purpose was not so much to proue the ministration of their Communion to be called a sacrifice, as to disproue the Sacrifice of the Aulter, which Eusebius in my Answer alleged, calleth in respect of Christes body and bloude offered in the same, the Sacrifices of Christes table.*

To that ende he semeth to haue alleged Eusebius, because he nameth that, which Christ deliuered vnto vs to offer vp daily vnto God, *a memorie*. As though Christes body and bloud could not be really present in these holy Mysteries, if that which we doo, be a memorie or cōmemoratiō of that which Christ did. Yeas forsooth M. Iewel, The Sacrifice that we offer, when we doo that which Christ at his last Supper cōmaūded vs to do, is the memorie of the body and bloud of Christ, and in respect of the thing offered and sacrificed, the very and true body and bloud of Christ it self. And this is accordig to the doctrine of S. Augustin, who saith, as is afore reherfed, *The Christians do celebrate the memorie of the Sacrifice (of the Crosse) now performed (which Eusebius in respect of the thing offered calleth the maruelous Sacrifice, and passing hoste) with the holy Oblation and Participation of the body and bloude of Christe*. If they doo it with the Oblation and participation of the body and bloude of Christe, then is the body and bloud of Christe present, then is it offered, and

παρὰ  
σους.  
\* ἀντὶ θυ.  
οἴκας

A. memorie of the Sacrifice of the Crosse, excludeth not the Sacrifice of the Aulter.

Aug. cons.  
Fausl. lib.  
20. cap. 12.

participated, which Eusebius for that cause calleth *the Sacrifices of Christes Table*.

*Eusebins also* (saith M. Iewel) *calleth this a Sacrifice of praise*. In deee, as I declared before, Eusebius speaketh of diuers Sacrifices. Of the Sacrifice of the Crosse, of the sacrifices of the table of Christ, of the Sacrifice of praise, of prayers, of a contrite harte. And what if he speake of the Sacrifice of praise, wil it thereof folow M. Iewel by your new Logique, that the Sacrifices of Christes table be not taken in Eusebius for the body and bloude of Christ? And I pray you, may not the selfe same in one respect be a Sacrifice of Praise, and also in an other respect, the Sacrifice of Christes body and blood? When wil you leaue your common woont, to disproue one truth by an other truth? If one should say vnto you concerning a sorte of your Ministers standing before you at a visitatiō, Sir these felowes be no Ministers of Gods worde, and holy Sacramētes, for they be handy Craftesmen: would you not answer him, Sir your reason is naught, for they be Ministers, and honest Craftesmen both? No better is your reason, where you say, This Sacrifice, is a Sacrifice of Praise, and of thanks geuing, or it is a memorie, and a sampler of the bloody Sacrifice, *ergo*, it is not the Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe, it is not a true, and a very Sacrifice. For there is no inconuenience in attributing these names and termes vnto the most blessed Sacrament and Sacrifice of the Altuler, diuers respectes being considered.

M. Iewels  
common  
custom to  
disproue  
one truth  
by an o-  
ther  
truth.

A. plaine  
testimonie  
for  
the Sacri-  
fice of the  
Altuler.

But M. Iewel, how happed it, that where you founde in *Eusebius*, *Sacrificium laudis*, the Sacrifice of Praise (the Greeke whereof also you would needes to be noted in the



the margent of your booke, though with addition of an article more then is in the Doctour: you saw not among the manifold sacrifices there reckened, this Sacrifice so expressly set foorth and cōmended with these wordes?

θύομεν τὸ ἕνθεον καὶ σεμνὸν καὶ ἱερόπρεπές θύμα, θύομεν καὶ ὡς κατὰ Euseb. lib. τὴν κοινὴν διαθήκην τὴν καθάραν θυσίαν. That is to say, We i. de De- sacrifice the diuine, and honorable, and most holy Sacrifice. monst. in We sacrifice the pure Sacrifice after a new manner according sine. to the newe Testament. By which description that, which we cal the Sacrifice of the Aulter, is plainly signified.

Againe how could you not see the manifest mention of the Aulter, whereon this Sacrifice is offred, there a little before expressed? And least you might auoide the force of that cleare testimonie by expounding it of the spiritual Aulter of mans harte, remember that he speaketh of such an Aulter, as might not by Moses lawe be set vp, but onely in Iewrie, and that as there he saith in one on- ly Citie of that Prouince. As for the spiritual Aulter of mens hartes, Moses Lawe did neuer forbid. An Aul- ter (saith Eusebius) of unbloudy and reasonable sacrifices, is now erected, according to the new Mysteries of the new Te- stament, ouer al the Worlde, both in Egypte and in other na- tions, &c. What can be vnderstanded by this Aulter buil- ded in witnesse of the abrogation of Moses Lawe, of his Aulter at Hierusalem, and of his vncleane Sacrifices, as there Eusebius discourseth, and that according to the new Mysteries of the newe Testament: but the external Aulter of the Church, whereupon the body and bloud of Christe, in forme of bread and wine, the external Sacri- fice, as S. Gregorie Nazianzen calleth it, is offered, and the most holy and dreadful Mysteries are celebrated?

A testimo-  
nie for  
material  
Aulter.

θυσιᾶς  
πρὸς ἀνά-  
μνησιν καὶ  
λοῦσιν  
θυσιῶν  
ἀνεγέ-  
ται.

In Apolo-  
getico.

Hath Satan the enimie of this Sacrifice ſo blinded your harte with malice againſt the ſame , that you ſaw the ſacrifice of Praise , of Praiers , and other mere ſpiritual Sacrifices , and this moſt Diuine , moſt high , and moſt ſpecial Sacrifice of the Churche could not ſee , ſo euidently and with ſo expreſſe colours ſet forth in the ſame place ? What can be ſaid in your excuſe ? Either you ſaw this much in Eusebius your ſelfe , or you truſted your Greeke frende of Oxford , whoſe helpe for the fuller ſtuffing of your great booke you vſed , as it is known. If you ſaw it , and of purpoſe would conceale it , and by reherſing other Sacrifices thought ſo to couer this Sacrifice : then great was your malice . If you ſawe it not , but truſted your Grecian , and ſuch other ſlipper Merchantes , who knewe wel your humour , and perceiued what ſhoulde pleaſe your appetite : then were you very raſh and vnwiſe , and thereby haue geuen occaſion to al wiſe men to take good aduiſe , how they beleue you in ſo weighty maters.

Hitherto M. Iewel , as now vnto the learned it is made cleare , hath ſaid litle for good Anſwere to the teſtimonie for the Sacrifice of the Altar , brought out of Eusebius . But what falſhoode he hath vſed , it is partely diſcloſed . If thou marke him wel Reader , thou ſhalt perceiue this ſleight in him , that he neuer reherſeth the woordes of Eusebius , as I haue alledged them . For in dede they ſeme to grauel him , and to be ſo plaine , as with plaineneſſe he ſeeth no way how to anſwer them . Craftily he diſſembleth *the Sacrifices of Chriſtes table* ſpoken of by Eusebius in the plural number , whereby he vnderſtandeth the body  
and

bloude of Christe, of which eche one is a Sacrifice, that is to say, the thing sacrificed, and consecrated seu-  
rally in the seuerall fourmes of breade and wine, in Commemoration and Remembraunce of the Body and Bloude, whiche were seuered the one from the other by violence of the souldiers vpon the Crosse: and nameth *the Sacrifice of the Lordes Table* in the singular number, for the better oportunitie to deceiue the vnlearned Reader.

M. Jewels  
guileful  
dealing.

Jewel.

But *Ensebius* saith further, This Sacrifice is dreadful, and causeth the harte to quake. *M. Harding* may not vvel geather by any force of these vvordes, that the Sonne of God is Really offered vp by the Priest vnto his Father. For althings, vvbat so euer, that put vs in remembrance of the Maiestie, and Iudgements of God, of the Holy Fathers are called Dreadful. *S. Cyril* saith, *Lectio Diuinarum*, & *Terribilium Scripturarum*: The reading of the Diuine, and Terrible Scriptures. *S. Cyril in Apol. Chry*  
*Chrysostome* calleth the vvordes of Baptisme, *Verba arcana*, & metuenda, & horribiles *Canones dogmatum de Caelo transmissorum*: *Hom. 49.*  
The Secrete, and Dreadful vvordes, and Terrible Rules of the doctrine, that came from Heauen. And speaking of the Hande, and voice of the Deacon, he saith thus, *Manu illa Tremenda*, & continua Voce clamans, alios vocat, alios arcet: VVith that Terrible Hand, and continual Voice crieinge, somme he calleth in, and somme he putteth of.

This Sacrifice maketh the Harte to tremble, for that therein is laide forth the Myserie, that vvas hidden from vvorlds, and Generations: The horroure of Sinne: The Death of the Sonne of God: that he tooke our beauienesse, and bare our sorowes, and vvas vvounded for our offenses, and vvas Rente, and Tormented for our VVickednesse: That he vvas carried like an innocent Lambe vnto the Slaughtre: that he cried vnto his Father, O God, O my God, vvby haste thou thus forsaken mee?

There

Chryſoſt.  
in 1. ad  
Corinth.  
Hom. 17.

There we cal to Remembrance al the cauſes, and circumſtances of Chriſts Death: The Shame of the Croſſe: The Darkening of the Aye: The Shaking of the Earth: The renting of the Vele: the cleauing of the Rocks: The opening of the Graues: The Deſcending into Hel: and the Cōquering of the Diuel. Therefore Chryſoſtome ſaith, Quāuis quis lapis eſſet, illa nocte audita, quomodò cū Diſcipulis triſtis fue: it, quomodò traditus, quomodò ligatus, quomodò abductus, quomodò iudicatus, quomodò deniq; oīa Paſſus, cera mollior fiet, & terrā, & omnē terræ cogitationem abijciēt: Any man hearing of the order of that night, how Chriſte was moorneſul emonge his Diſciples, howe he was deliuered, how he was bound, how he was leadde away, how he was arreigned, and how meekely he ſuffered al, that was donne vnto him, were he as harde as a Stoane, yet woulde he be as ſofte as VVaxe, and would throwe both the Earth, and al Earthely Cogitations away from him.

Thus ſaith Nicolaus Cabasilas, one of M. Hardings late Greeke Doctors: Hoc facite in meā Commemorationem. Sed quānam eſt hæc Commemoratio? &c. Doo ye this in Remembrance of me. But what is this Remembrance? Howv doo we conſider: Our Lorde in the Holy Miniſtration? VVhat doo we conceiue him doing? Howv dealing? vvhat ſuffering? vvhat thinke vve? vvhat ſpeake vve of him? Do vve imagin of him (in that time of the Holy Myſteries) that he healed the Blinde? That he raiſed the Dead? That he ſtaied the VVindes? Or that vvith a ſewē loaves he fead thouſandes: which are tokens, that he was God Omnipotent? No, not ſo. But rather we cal to remembrance ſuch thinges, as declared his weakenesse: his Croſſe, his Paſſion, his Deathe: In reſpect of thoſe thinges he ſaid, Doo yee this in my Remembrance. The Prieſt both by his wordes, and alſo by the vvhole Circumſtance of doinge, ſeemeth to ſay, Thus Chriſte came to his Paſſion: Thus he vvās vvounded in the ſide: Thus he died: Thus Bloud and VVater iſſaed, and ſtreamed from his vvounde. Theſe conſiderations, thus laide before our eies, are hable to cauē any godly harte to quake, and tremble. As for the Real offeringe up of Chriſte in Sacrifice, that learned Father Eusebius ſaith nothing.

Verily,

Verily, it is but a simple Sophisme to say, This Sacrifice is Dreadful, and causeth vs to quake: Ergo, The Priest offereth vp the Sonne of God vnto his Father.

*Harding.*

Whereas I gather an Argument of a plaine testimonie for the Sacrifice of the Aulter, out of the whole sentēce alleged: M. Iewel pretendeth to his Reader, as though I tooke my chiefe and onely holde of this one worde, *Dreadful*, which being but one worde in Eusebius, he maketh to sounde many wordes, and saith, *that I may not gather by any force of these wordes, that the Sonne of God is really offered vp by the Priest vnto his Father.* Whereas in deed I gather it not by force of that woorde, *Dreadful* (whereof for his aduantage he maketh diuers woordes) onely, nor chiefly: but of the whole saying, and specially of the very expresse name of *the Sacrifice of Christes table*, and also of that Eusebius saith, *We haue bene taught by Christe him selfe to offer them vnto God.* Which I expounde, as they are to be expounded, of these woordes spoken by Christe at his Supper, *Hoc facite in meam commemorationē*, doo ye this in my remembrance, as it is to be sene in my Answer, and he dissembled to haue sene it. As for *the Sonne of God really offered vp*, they be not my wordes, as the booke is witnesse, they be his, whereby he thought to take aduantage, though the Proposition in those termes also be true, in a right and due sense.

Bicause therefore he groundeth his Replie vpon that which I say not, and bestoweth many wordes in disproving that I affirme not, and prouing that I denie not, and maketh a long needelesse talke of the worde, *Dreadful*,

CC shewing,



shewing sundry thinges to be called *Dreadful* ( wherein he telleth some truth ) pretending to the Reader thereby , as though bicause Eusebius is alleged calling this Sacrifice *Dreadful*, thereof specially I had concluded the auctoritie of offering Christe vnto his Father, whiche thing in dede I do not: And forasmuch as this much is vnto truly attributed vnto me, and therefore may with like facilitie be denyed , as it is without proufe said , and the whole processe of the rest of this Diuision is vtterly impertinent , and besides the purpose : I thinke this much ynough for answer vnto it , that it is not worth the answering.

The . 6 . Diuision .

The Answer.

*Hesychius*  
*lib. 1. c. 4.*

*1041. 10.*

**T**hat Christe Sacrificed him selfe at his Supper, *Hesychius affirmeth with these wordes: Quod Dominus iussit (Leuit. 4.) vt Sacerdos vitulū pro peccato oblaturus, ponat manū super caput eius, & iugulet eū corā Domino, Christū significat, quem nemo obtulit, sed nec immolare poterat, nisi semetipsum ipse ad patiendū tradidisset. Propter quod non solum dicebat, Potestatem habeo ponendi animam meam, & potestatem habeo iterum sumēdi eam: sed & pręueniens semetipsum in Cœna Apostolorū immolauit, quod sciunt, qui Mysteriorum percipiunt,*

piunt virtutem. That our Lord commaunded (saith he) the Priest, which should offer a calfe for sinne, to put his hande vpon his heade, and to sticke him before our Lord, it signifieth Christ, whom noman hath offered, neither could any man Sacrifice him, excepte he hadde deliuered him selfe to suffer. For the which he said not only, I haue power to lay downe my Soule, and I haue power to take it againe: But also preuenting it, he offred vp him selfe in Sacrifice in the Supper of the Apostles: which they knowe, y<sup>e</sup> receiue the vertue of the Mysteries. By these wordes of Hesychius we learne, that Christ offered, and sacrificed his Body and Bloud twise. Firste in that Holy Supper vnbloudely, when he tooke Bread in his handes, and brake it, &c: Without Diuision of the Sacrifice, for it is but one and the same Sacrifice. And afterwarde on the Crosse, with Shedding of his bloud, and that is it, he meaneth by the woorde, Preuenting.

Iewel.

We denie not, but it may vvel be saide, Christe at his last Supper offered vp him selfe vnto his Father: Albeit, not Really, and in deede, but, accordinge to M. Hardinges owne Distinction, in a Figure, or in a Myserie: in suche sorte, as vve say, Christe vvas offered in the Sacrifices of the Olde Lawe: and as S. Iohn saith, Agnus Occisus ab Origine Mundi: The Lambe was shaine from the beginninge of the VVorlde. As Christe vvas slaine at the Table; so vvas he Sacrificed at the Table. But he vvas not slaine at the Table Verily, and in dede, but onely in a Myserie: Therefore he vvas not Sacrificed at the Table Really, and in deede, but onely in a Myserie.

CC ij

So saith

August.  
Epist. 23.

So saith S. Augustine, Nonne semel immolatus est Christus in semetipso? Et tamen in Sacramento, non tantum per omnes Paschæ Solennitates, sed etiam omni die populis immolatur. Nec utique mentitur, qui interrogatus, eum responderit immolari. Si enim Sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum, quarum Sacramenta sunt, non haberent, omnino Sacramenta non essent. Was not Christe once offered in him selfe? And yet in (or, by way of) a Sacramente, not only at the Solemne Feaste of Easter, but euery daye he is offered vnto the people. And he saith no vntrueth, that being demaunded, maketh answere, that Christe is Sacrificed. His reason is this: For if Sacramentes had not a certaine Likeness, or Resemblance of the thinges, wherof they be Sacramentes, then should they vtterly be no Sacramentes.

Harding.

The contentes of M. Iewels Replie in this Diuision stand in .4. pointes.

1. First, he graunteth that Christe offered vp him selfe vnto his Father at his last Supper, in a figure, or in a Mysterie, that is to say, as he expoundeth himselfe, in such sorte, as he was offered vp in the Sacrifices of the olde Lawe: But that he was there really, and in dede offred, he vtterly denieth.

2. Secondly, for answer to the authoritie alleged out of Hesychius, he saith, that sometimes he was driuen to streatche, and straine the Scriptures to his purpose.

3. Thirdly, he would prooue his Sacramentary opinion touching the difference between the Sacrifice of the Table, and the Sacrifice of the Crosse, by a place of S. Cyprian, leauing out that which foloweth in him, being such as clearly determineth the point against him.

4. Fourthly, whereas I say, that Christe twice sacrificed him

him selfe really, he auoucheth it to be reprobued by plaine wordes of S. Paule.

Of the fallhode of the first point, though I haue spoken somewhat already, yet because M. Iewel ceaseth not to sing one song, and estones repeateth the same tale, standing vppon his false Negatiue: some deale more semeth here necessary to be spoken: that it may appeare how cleare the truth is of our side, and how weake the stuffe is, that he bringeth against vs.

Although he tel not his tale in most distincte, and plaine wise, as this doctrine of the vnbloudy Sacrifice of Christe ought to be vttered, vsing the termes of *Figure*, and *Mysterie*, confusely: yet his meaning is plaine yenough, verely more plaine, then true: Which is, that Christe offered vp him selfe vnto his Father at his laste Supper in *Figure* onely, and that, concerning both the thing offered, and the manner of offering: For adding as it were an exposition of his owne wordes, *In such sorte*, saith he, *as we say, Christe was offered in the Sacrifice of the olde Lawe.* Now certaine it is, that in the sacrifices of the olde Lawe Christe was offered in *Figure* onely, whether we consider the substance that was offered, or the manner of offering. The substance of those olde Sacrifices, was a brute beast, a sheepe, a calfe, a goat, an Oxe. Of which euery one was but a figure onely of Christ: the manner of offering was slaughter with bloudshed, which slaughter was also a figure onely of Christes bloudy death to be suffered vppon the Crosse: So M. Jewels doctrine touching this point is figuratiue on euery side, that is to say, that Christe offered vp him selfe at his supper in *Figure* onely.

M. Jewels doctrine touching the Sacrifice, is onely figuratiue.

Yet vnderstanding with him self, and as it were, being guilty in his owne conscience, that this doctrine soundeth very strangely, and would offend the eares of the learned Catholiques: in the conclusion he qualifieth his tale with termes, and shunning the odious woorde of a *Figure onely*, guilefully shifteth in the worde *Mysterie*, saying, that *Christe was not sacrificed at the Table really, and in dede, but onely in a Mysterie.*

Nowe that our disputation fall not into wrangling and cauilles; here he is to be demaunded, what he meaneth by this terme, *onely in a Mysterie*, in this Proposition, *Christe was not sacrificed at the Table really, but onely in a Mysterie.*

Onely in  
a Mysterie.

If he meane nothing els thereby, but to exclude the bloody manner of sacrificing, as in deede properly to speake, the sacrificing of lyuing thinges is with bloude-shed and slaughter: in that respecte we graunte also, that at the Table Christe was not really so sacrificed, but in Mysterie only. For at the Table we knowe, he was not stickte with a knife, as the brute beastes in the olde Lawe were, nor let bloude with thornes, nailles, or speare, as he was on the nexte morow vppon the Crosse.

Mary where the exclusiue particle, *Onely*, is added, though in a right sense we might beare with it, as it is referred to the mystical manner of sacrificing: yet we say, it is strangely vsed in this place, where it may haue relation to two thinges, either to the body and bloud of Christe being the substance of the Sacrifice, or to the manner of sacrificing.

But if by his terme, *Onely in a Mysterie*, he exclude



clude the Real presence of Christe him selfe, and  
 meane that his very body and bloude ( as muche to say,  
 Christe him selfe bicause of the vnitie of the two na-  
 tures ) was not in Christes handes, and vpon the Ta-  
 ble in deede, when hauing taken breade he gaue than-  
 kes, blessed, brake it, and said, *this is my Body*, and con- Luca 22.  
 cerning the Cuppe, *this is my Bloude*, ne is not nowe  
 in the Aulter, when we consecrate, doing that Christe  
 did, and bad vs to doo, but that he was there then, Only.  
 and is here now at the Diuine Celebration, in a figure,  
 signe, token, signification, memorie, representation,  
 or Mysterie Onely, or that a figure, signe, token, or  
 Mysterie Onely is present, and sacrificed, and not very  
 Christe him selfe: If this be his meaning, herein we dis-  
 sent vtterly from him, and he dissenteth from the Chur-  
 che of God, from that the holy Ghoste hath taught his  
 Church, from that al faithful Christen people hath euer  
 beleueed, from that Christe him selfe professed, saying,  
*this is my body, this is my bloude*: to be shorte, from that,  
 which hath bene of late by certaine learned men against  
 him, and his felowes sufficiently, and substantially  
 prooued.

But what neede we to demaunde of M. Iewel, what  
 he meaneth by his clowdy wordes? No clowde can hyde  
 his Sacramentarie heresie, it is euident, as wel by that he  
 saith here, as by that he hath said and writtē in fundry o-  
 ther places, according to the purport of the Calvinists do-  
 ctine (vnto which sect he hath adioyned him self) and by  
 his open profession, that he standeth in his Negative, and  
 holdeth opinion, that Christe offered not him selfe really  
 at his last Supper. Now the affirmatiue part, which is, that  
 Christe

Christe offered him selfe at that Supper really, truly, and in dede, and made a real Sacrifice, though it be in my Answer already proued: yet here further for their sake, who breake not out of the Church by their own stubbornesse, and wilful malice, but be lead a syde by simplicitie, and ignorance: thus we prooue.

If Christe offered not vp him selfe really and in dede in a Sacrifice at his last Supper, he least his new Lawe in worse state then was the condition of them, who liued in the time of the Lawe of Nature, or in the time of the Lawe written. But in worse state he leaste it not: *Ergo*, he sacrificed him selfe at the Supper truly, really, and in dede.

The *Minor*, or second Proposition is such, as no Christen man (Iudge) wil deny, or doubt of. The first Proposition, which is conditional, shal sone appeare true to him, who considereth, that the good and godly people lyuing vnder the Lawe of Nature before any Lawe was written, by the inspiration of God (as S. Cyprian witnesseth) offered vp real sacrifices, in which they protested their faith, and trust in Christe to come, by whose Sacrifice to be made vpon the Crosse they looked, and hartily desyred to be saued. So did Abel offer vp Sacrifice to God of the best of his flocke. So did Noe offer vp Sacrifice of the cleane beastes, that had ben with him in the Arke. So Abraham, after that he had (for so much as in him was) offered vp his onely sonne Isaac, did in stede of him sacrifice the Ramme, that was tyed by the hornes among the brambles. So did other iust and good men of that time, offer vp the like sacrifices to the same ende.

Cyprian.  
Sermone  
de ratione  
circum-  
cisionis.  
Gen. 4.  
Gen. 8.  
Gen. 22.

As for

As for the time of the lawe written, who is so ignorant, that knoweth not, that real sacrifices of sundry beastes, beside other thinges were commaunded to be offred vp for diuers particular endes, yet al to one chiefe ende, to foreshignifie and prefigure the most perfite Sacrifice of Christe to come? Al these sacrifices although offred in a figure, and signification of benefite that then was to come, yet were they real and true sacrifices notwithstanding, as consisting of real and true substances. And thus we see, that by Gods prouidence in the time of both Lawes, of Nature, and of Moyses, real sacrifices were offred vp vnto him in figure and token of the Redemption to come.

Now then if Christe leaue to the newe lawe, which he ordeined, no real Sacrifice (a Sacrifice being the chiefeest worship that man can do vnto God) but endued it with a sacrifice, that is offred onely in a figure: how did he not leaue it in worse case, then the lawe of nature, or the lawe written? And certaine it is, that he leaft it without any such Sacrifice, onlesse he offering himselfe really at his Supper, did beginne and institute it after the order of Melchisedek. For in any time, or place els, instituted, and commaunded, it is not founde. Concerning inward, and mere spiritual sacrifices, they be common to al times and lawes, as it is before proued.

If M. fewel, and the mainteiners of this new Gospel, put vs in mynde of bread and wine, and tel vs that the substance of bread and wine is our real Sacrifice, being the signes and figures of Christes body and blood in the Lordes Supper: to that we answer, that bread and wine are not appointed, and ordeined by Christe, to be

the real Sacrifice of the Church: and if they were, then were the state of the new Testament no better then that of the olde Testamēt, whereas the new farre passing the olde in euery degree of worthinesse, as S. Paule in sundry places declareth, the Sacrifice frequented in the newe lawe, ought to surmount the Sacrifices of the olde lawe. Then hath the Church made a very meane exchange with the Iewish Synagog. For if we haue no better substance in our dayly Sacrifice, then a peece of bread and a smal portion of wine: how was not a goate, a lambe, an Oxe, as good, if not better, and more worth?

Christe hath not so slenderly dealt with the heires of the newe Testament, as to leaue so base and vnworthy a sacrifice vnto them (base and vnworthy I say, in comparison of the high dignitie, that God through his sonnes death hath called them vnto) but by his almighty power, and according to his passing great mercy and loue, hath geuen no worse thing then him selfe, to be their true and real Sacrifice.

Some one wil say perhappes, I woulde beleue this doctrine the rather, if it were confirmed with the testimonie of an Auncient learned Father. Let vs heare then, what S. Chrysostome saith touching this point. His wordes be these. *In veteri quidem Testamento, cum imperfectiores essent, quem idolis offerebant sanguinem, cum ipse accipere voluit, ut ab idolis nos auerteret. Quod etiam inenarrabilis amoris signum erat. Hic autem multo admirabilius & magnificentijs sacrificium preparauit, & quum sacrificium commutaret, & pro brutorum cade se ipsum offerendum praeceperet.* In the olde Testament,

Chrysost.  
in. 1. Cor.  
10. Ho. 24  
A cleare  
testimonie  
ny for  
the Sacri  
fice of  
Christe  
in the  
Church.

stament, when men were more vnperfecte, Christe him selfe would take that bloude, which they offered vp vnto Idols, to thende to turne them from Idolatrie. Which thing was a signe of an vnspeakeable loue. But here (in the newe Testament) he hath prepared a much more maruelous and honorable Sacrifice, both in that he changed the Sacrifice, and also for that in stede of the slaughter of brute beastes, he commaunded his owne selfe to be offered.

Here we haue by testimony of this auncient Father, the abolishing of the worse sacrifice, and the appointment of a better. That was made of brute beastes, this of Christe him selfe. Now consider good Reader, whether reason wil beare it, that the worse and baser sacrifice should be both real, and also in figure and signification (for so were al the Iewes sacrifices) and the better be in figure or mysterie onely, and not real, as M. Iewel wil haue the Sacrifice of the Church to be.

But that our Sacrifice is real, and that it is Christe him selfe, and that he is really and in deede sacrificed: the woordes aboue reherfed, and others of the like force in that place of S. Chrylostome doo plainly auouche. For first let this be examined, that, as he saith, *Christe commaunded for the slaughter of brute beastes, now in the new Testament, him selfe to be offered.* Of what Sacrifice can this be meant, but of that which he both made, and instituted him selfe at his last Supper, and gaue charge to be frequented and done, vntil he come? For as touching the sacrifice of the Crosse, though he suffered him selfe to be taken, and to be



crucified, and to be offred vp with shedding of bloude vnto death; yet he commaunded not so much to be done, for then had the wicked workers of his death ben gilleste.

Luca 22.

1. Cor. 11.

Chrysost.  
in Litur-  
gia.

This commaundement then of offering vp Christe him selfe, is vnderstanded to haue ben geuen at the Supper, when after that he had consecrated his body and bloude, he said, *doo ye this in my remembrance*. And therefore S. Chrysostom speaketh thus vnto Christe in his Liturgie or Masse, *Memoriam igitur agentes huius salutaris mandati, &c.* We kepe the memorie of this healthful commaundement.

If M. Iewel replye, and say, that Christe commaunded at the supper a memory onely to be celebrate of the true and real Sacrifice vpon the Crosse: to that we answer. That this Sacrifice, whereof we speake, is a memorie of that, we confesse: but that it is a memorie onely, so as the real presence of Christ be excluded, that we deny: and to the contrary S. Chrysostome saith, that he commaunded, *seipsum, him selfe* to be offred vp.

Christe  
commaun-  
ded him  
selfe to be  
offred vp.

Neither can M. Iewel shifte the mater from him by expounding this worde, *him selfe*, of the signe or figure of him selfe, meaning the bread and wine, as the Sacramentaries doo: For if that, which is now daily in the Church offered vp at the Aulter, were but bread and wine, the signes of Christes body and bloude: S. Chrysostome woulde not, ne could not iustly haue said, that *Christe hath prepared for vs of the newe Testament, multo admirabilius, & magnificentius Sacrificium, a much more maruelous, and honorable Sacrifice*. For how can we conueie a peece of bread, and a cuppe of wine, to be in respect

specte of sacrifice, a thing muche more maruelous, and magnificent, or honourable, then a shepe, a goate, and an Oxe, bothe these and those signifying al one thinge, that is, Christe him selfe? Nay thinges compared with thinges, are not the beastes of a farre more price?

Itrow M. Iewel wil not set a greater price vpon the bread and wine vsed in this Sacrifice, for that they signifie a more pretious thing, then the brute beastes did in the sacrifices of the olde lawe, to wit, Christe already come, whereas they signified Christe to come. For so he should diuide Christe, and imagine him to be better and worthier in the newe Testament, then he was in the olde. Verely though redemption perfourmed be to vs better, then redemption promised: yet Christe before and after the perfourmance, that is to say, Christe now come, and then to come, is one Christe, and of one worthinesse.

It foloweth therefore by al meanes, that either S. Chrysostome said vntruly, affirming Christe to haue prepared for the new Testament a farre more wonderful and magnificent Sacrifice, then were the sacrifices of the Iewes, whiche I suppose M. Iewel wil not be so shamelesse as to say, what so euer he thinke: or that we haue now in the Sacrifice of the Church, Christe him selfe, truly, really, and in deede, and that he him selfe is really offred vp vnto his Father by Priestes of the new Testament, according to the commaundement he gaue at his supper, saying, *doe ye this in my remembrance.*

And that it is the real and true bloude of Christe, which we haue in the Sacrifice of the Aulter, whereby

vvitnes  
for the  
true and  
real bloud  
of Christ  
in the Sac  
rament,

the real Sacrifice touching the thing sacrificed is pro-  
ued: it is most clearely affirmed by S. Chrysostome in  
the place before alleged. For thus he speaketh there.

Chrysoſt. *Quid hoc admirabilis, dic quaſo, quid amabilis? Hoc &*  
in prior. *amantes faciunt, cum amatos intuentur alienorum cupidi-*  
ad Cor. *tate affectos, ſua verò contemnes: proprijs elargitis ſua-*  
Hom. 24. *dent, ut ab illis abſtineant. Sed amantes quidem in pecu-*  
*nijs, veſtibus, poſſeſſionibus, hanc oſtendunt cupiditatem,*  
*in proprio ſanguine nemo unquam.* What thing I pray thee,  
is more maruelous then this? What more louing? (He  
ſpeaketh of the bloud that is in the chalice, which he ſaith  
to be the ſame that ranne out of Chriſtes ſyde) This is a  
thing that louers doo, when they beholde them whom  
they loue, to be allured with the deſire of other mens  
thinges, and to ſet litle by theirs: they geue them their  
owne thinges, and intreate them to abſteine from others.  
But louers ſhewe this their deſire in money, in garmen-  
tes, in poſſeſſions, in his owne bloude no man euer  
ſhewed it.

Figure on  
ly exclus  
ded.

To proue that Chriſte loueth vs more, then euer any  
man loued an other, he ſaith, that he geueth vs his owne  
bloude. Which in this place of S. Chrysostome, can in  
no wiſe be expounded of the Figure and token of his  
bloude. For worldly louers geue vnto their beloued as  
much, and as good a thing as that, namely money,  
garmentes, their poſſeſſions. As for a token or ſigne of  
their bloude, or of their perſons, it were eaſy for them  
to geue. But Chriſt (ſaith he) ſheweth his loue toward vs,  
by that whereby no man euer ſhewed his loue to an  
other. If the onely token of bloude, might at any time  
haue declared ſo certaine and aſſured loue, louers would  
often

oftentimes haue spared their money, their garmentes, and their possessions: and would haue geuen vnto their dere beloued, the figure of their bloude, or of their whole persons.

Thus is the true and real presence of Christes bloud, and consequently of his flesh, prooued by witness of S. Chysofome. And by the same is that prooued, which we call the real Sacrifice of the Church. For by that we say Christe to be really offered vp vnto his Father, we meane none other thing, but that the substance, which we offer and sacrifice, is the real body and bloude of Christe. This much therefore may stande for answer to M. Iewels Reply in this place: Christe in the Sacrifices of the olde Lawe, was so offred in a Figure, as he was not the substance of them. In the Supper he was, and in the Masse he is so offered, as he is the substance present.

And because this real Sacrifice of Christe, being the Sacrifice of the New Testament, and the worthinesse of it, is much impugned by the enemies of the Church in our time, yea villanously mocked, skoffed, and railed at by Antichristes wicked broode: the godly Catholiques may by these reasons be sufficiently armed against them.

If it were necessary for the people of the olde Lawe to haue real sacrifices to protest, and to mainteine their beleefe in Christes Death to come: why is it not as necessary, that the faithful people of the Newe Lawe, haue also a real Sacrifice, to protest and keepe in memorie their beleefe in Christes Death already past?

Reasons, vvh whereby the Catholiques may be armed against the Sacramentaries for defense of this Sacrifice.

Againe,

Againe, as the newe Lawe is better, and excellenter then the olde, so is it necessary it haue a better and excellenter Sacrifice. But if we take away the Sacrifice of the Reall flesh and bloude of Christe, and leaue onely bread and wine to be offred vp in a figure, or mysterie: then haue we not a Sacrifice proper vnto the new Law, that in worthinesse passeth and excelleth the Sacrifices of the olde Lawe, as the which consisted of, as good a substance, as the other, and signified as good a thing, as the other, and expressed it by slaughter, and shedding of pure and innocent beastes bloude more liuely, then the other.

Luce 22.  
Matth 26

Contrarywise let the real body and bloude of Christe be the substance of the Sacrifice of the new Law (as the truth teacheth saying, *this is my body which is geue for you, this is my bloud which is shed for you, &c.* and the Church beleueth): then doth it infinitely excel al the Sacrifices offered in the Lawe of Nature, or in the Lawe written. And then shal the New Lawe, as in greatenesse of graces, and promises, and plainenesse of Scripture: so surmount and passe also the olde Lawe in Maiestie of the Sacrifice, and of Priesthode, whiche haue euer in al Lawes ben accompted the two principal pointes of the same.

To be shorte, how can it be conceiued, that our Sacrifice should be but a figure, a signe, or a mysterie onely, and no true and real Sacrifice better then the olde sacrifices: sith that by the reaching of al the auncient learned Fathers, it is the truth, and perfourmance of al the olde sacrifices?

Hauiug said this much for the real offering of Christe

let vs



let vs now examine M. Iewels argument. *As Christe* Examina-  
tion of M.  
Iuels Ar-  
gument.  
*was slaine at the Table (saith he) so was he sacrificed at the*  
*Table. But he was not slaine at the Table verely, and in dede,*  
*but onely in a Mysterie: Therefore he was not sacrificed*  
*at the Table, really, and in dede, but onely in a Mysterie.*

Christe was then, and is now also at the holy Table,  
both really sacrificed in respect of his real and true bo-  
dy and bloude by vertue of the Worde made present,  
and also in a Mysterie, in respect of the outward formes  
of bread and wine vnder which they are present, and  
of the mystical manner of sacrificing. This being true,  
as before we haue declared, and therefore the Conclu-  
sion being false: let vs see, which of the Premisses of  
M. Iewels Argument is false. It is the *Maior*, or first  
Proposition. If the same be resolued into the partes  
whereof it consisteth, the vntruth wil soone appeare.  
The first parte is this. *Christe was slaine at the Table.*  
That is false. The second is this. *Christe was sacrificed*  
*at the Table.* That is true. So that one parte is false,  
and the other true. And so by this trial, which is the su-  
rest way to trie such kinde of Propositions, the whole  
Proposition in it selfe is found false, and therefore the  
Conclusion foloweth not.

For the better euidence of the thing it selfe, we  
most gladly acknowledge, and protest to the worlde,  
that Christe was really and in dede slaine, and put to  
death once for euer, and neuer shal againe suffer the  
paines of Death. Yet neuerthelesse he is, and shal to  
the worldes ende continue, the real and true Sacrifice  
of the newe Testament, according to his owne merciful  
Institution at his last Supper. As for the lacke of any

slaying, and shedding of bloude, it is no cause at al, why it was not at the Supper, is not now, or may not be a true and real Sacrifice. For it is sufficient, that it was once offered vp with slaying, and bloude shedding to pay the raunson of our synnes. He did then, and we de now offer the same body and bloude in consideration and remembrance of that slaying, and shedding. He offered at the Supper his body, and blood, that on the morow was to be slaine, and shed: we at the Aulter do stil offer that body, and bloude, that was slaine, and shed, euen the same selfe body, and bloude in number. For, as Theo-

Theophy -  
lact. in 10.  
c. ad Heb.

phylacte folowing S. Chrysostome saith. *Eundem semper offerimus, Imò potius memoriam illius oblationis, qua seipsum obtulit, facimus, ceu nunc iam facta sit*, we offer vp alwaies the selfe same (Christe) or rather we kepe the memorie of that oblation, whereby he offered him selfe, as though it were euen right now donne.

In this point therefore this Sacrifice is clearly vnlike the sacrifices of the olde lawe, wherein although beastes of one kinde were offered daily, as for example, this day a lambe, and to morow likewise a lambe: yet it was not one lambe, but diuers lambes. And therfore a new killing and shedding of bloude was daily required. But we doo not offer this day one lambe, to morow an other, but alwaies the selfe same, as S. Chrysostome saith.

Chrysost.  
in epist.  
ad Heb.  
Hom. 17.  
Eundem.

Again this Hoste is suche, as can not be consumed, though they be neuer so many, that be made partakers of it, as he also saith. *Ipsam offerimus & nunc, qua tunc oblata quidem consumi nō potest*. We doo offer vp now also the same hoste, which being offered then (he

meaneth

meaneth vpon the Crosse) can not be consumed. Wherefore sith it is continually the selfe same hoste, in number with that, which was slaine vpon the Crosse, albeit it be really againe sacrificed, to continue the memorie of the real death of the same, and to be the real Sacrifice of the newe Testament: M. Iewel going about to abolish the truth of our Sacrifice, for that it is not truly againe slaine, bewrayeth his owne penurie of better and sounder reasons, and semeth to reprove al the olde learned Fathers, for calling it the vnbloudy Sacrifice.

Iewel.

Notwithstandinge, Hesychius expoundinge the Booke of Leviticus, to the intente he may force the whole Storie of the Life, and Deathe of Christe, to answeare euery particulare Ceremonie of the Lawe, is sometimes driuen, to streatche, and straine the Scriptures to his purpose. So Hesych. in  
he saith, Christe is the Aultare: And, Christe Incarnate in the Virgins VVombe, is the Sodden Sacrifice. *Leuit. li. 1*  
*cap. 4.*

Now as Christe was the Aultare, and as he was Sacrificed in his Mothers VVombe, euen so he Sacrificed him selfe at his Supper: not in proper, or vsual manner of speache, but onely in a Myserie Signifieinge. *Li. 1. ca. 2.*  
*Sacrificiū*  
*Coctum.*

Otherwise S. Cyprian plainly openeth the whole difference of these two Sacrifices in this sorte: Dedit Dominus noster in mensa, in qua Vltimum cum Apostolis participauit Conuiuium, proprijs manibus Panem, & vinum: In Cruce verò manibus militum Corpus tradidit vulnerandum. Our Lorde at the Table, whereat  
Cypranus  
de Vnctio-  
ne Chris-  
matis.

hereceiued his laste Supper with his Disciples, with his owne handes gaue (not his very Bodie, and very Bloude Really, and in deede, but) Breade, and VVine: But vpon the Crosse, he gaue his owne Bodie, with the Souldiers handes to be VVounded. This, saith the Sainte Cyprian, is the difference betwene the Sacrifice of the Table, and the Sacrifice of the Crosse: At the one, Christe gaue Breade, and VVine: Vpon the other, he gaue his Bodie.

EE ¶

Therefore,

Therefore, whereas M. Harding saith, onely vpon his owne warrant, That Christe Really Sacrificed him selfe at two sundrie times, and that he twise Really Shead his Bloude, Firste at the Table, and Afterwarde vpon the Crosse: The vntueth, and folie hereof is easily reprov'd by these plaine wordes of S. Paule: Semel Oblatus est, ad multorum exhaustiendā peccata: He was once offered, to take away the sinnes of many. And againe, VVith one Sacrifice he hath made perfite them for euer, that be Sanctified. These places are cleare, and without question: onlesse M. Harding wil say that, One, and, Tyvo: and, Once, and Twise, be bothe one thing.

Hebra. 9.

Hebra. 10.

Harding.

Concerning the wordes of *Hesychius*, they be plaine for the real sacrifice of Christe at the Supper. For if he had there offered vp him selfe in a figure, or Mysterie only, as M. Iewel meaneth by his *only mystery*: he would neuer haue called it a *preuention of the bloody Sacrifice*, neither would he haue vsed the terme *præueniens*, preuenting. For Christe to offer vp him selfe at the supper in a figure onely, in such sorte as he was offered in the sacrifices of the olde lawe, had not ben a preuention of his bloody Sacrifice vpon the Crosse. Verely if M. Iewels vnderstanding were stretcht and strained vnto the obedience of faith, he would not say so sawcily of that auncient and learned Father, that *he is driuent to stretche and straine the Scriptures to his purpose*. And what if it were graunted, that so he did sometimes (for more this Replyer saith not him selfe) wil it thereof folow, that he hath so done in this place?

*Hesychius*  
In *Leuit.*  
*l. i. cap. 4.*

As for the stretching and straining of the Scriptures, which he layeth to *Hesychius* charge, it is a very simple answer to the authoritie out of him alleged. That he cal-

he calleth Christe the Aulcer, it is not strange, for so S. Paule calleth him, as there he allegeth. Neither was Christe by his reporte, sacrificed in his Mothers wombe, he was incarnate in the virginis wombe, and the same Christes incarnation, he calleth the baked Sacrifice, for thereof he speaketh, and not of a sodden sacrifice, as the place is euident. The Oouen wherein it was baked, was the Virgins wombe, *because (as he saith) shee receiued from above the bread of life, to wit, the worde of God, in her wombe, and the fire of the presence of the holy Ghoste. For the holy Ghoste (saith the Angel) shal come ouer into thee, and thee power of the highest shal ouershadou thee.*

*Hesychius  
in Leuit.  
li. i. cap. 2.  
Luca 1.*

And the same Christe, that was incarnate in the Virgins wombe, sacrificed him selfe at his Supper, although not in such manner, as the liue hostes in the olde Testament were sacrificed, that is to say, with bloudshed, and slaughter; yet in a mysterie, but truly, and really, and after that manner of speache, which is proper and vsual to the Catholique Church speaking of this singular Sacrifice, not *onely in a mysterie signifying*, that is to say, in a figure, or signification onely, as M. Iewel meaneth, the substance of Christes body and bloud excluded: but so in a mystery, as that most diuine substance be beleued to be verely present, and by vs in remembrance of his death presented to God.

Touching the place of S. Cyprian, *de vñtione Chrisma- tis*, he is like to haue smal aduantage, and lesse honesty by alleging it, when it is knowen, how falsly he hath done, in taking the begynning of the sentence, which being set a parte from the rest, semeth to geue a sownde of his doctrine, and cutting away the ende, that declareth the Do-

*S. Cyprian  
falsified  
by M.  
Ieuvels  
māgling,  
and hea  
vving.*



Cyprianus  
De unctio-  
ne Chris-  
matis.

etours meaning, and quit ouerthroweth the Sacramētary heresie. For immediatly after the wordes, that M. Jewel taketh for his purpose, wherby is signified, that *our Lorde at his last Supper gaue vnto his Apostles, bread and wine with his owne handes, and vpon the Crosse deliuered his body to be wounded with the handes of the Souldiers*: this much soloweth in the same sentēce. *Ut in Apostolis secretius impressa sincera veritas, & vera sinceritas exponeret Gentibus, quomodo vinū & panis, caro esset & sanguis, et quib. vōibus cause effectibus cōuenirēt, et diuersa nōia vel species ad vnā reducerētur essentiā, et significātia et significata eisdē vocabulis cēferentur.* That the sincere truth, and true sinceritie being secretly imprinted in th' Apostles might expōūd vnto the Gētils, how wine and bread should be his flesh and blood, and by what meanes the causes should be agreable to the effectes, and diuers names and kindes should be brought vnto one substance, and the thinges signifying, and the thinges signified, should be called by the same names.

Lo here it is declared, what bread and wine it was, as much to say, the flesh and blood of Christe, which S. Cyprian saith, he gaue at his last Supper vnto his Apostles. This cleare and sincere truth, or true sinceritie (so he calleth either the true doctrine of this Sacrifice, or the Sacrifice it self in respect of the sundry impure and typical sacrifices of Moses Lawe) he would secretly, that is, with th'inward knowledge of these secret mysteries, to be imprinted and digested in th' Apostles, to thinke they should expound vnto the Gentils, the Iewes with their olde sacrifices being now reiectēd, how at this heavenly banquet the bread and wine is flesh and blood: how the causes and effectes be agreable, that is to say, how the wordes of Cō

secre-

secratio duely pronouced by the Priest, and the power of the holy Ghoste, which are the causes, doo produce and make the body and bloud of our Lord, which be the effects: how thinges of diuers names, and diuers in nature, and therfore diuers kindes, be brought vnto one essence or substance, to wit, bread and wine, vnto the substance of Christes flesh and bloude, whereby Transubstantiation is wrought: briefly to conclude, how, whereas bread signifieth the body, and wine the bloud, the thinges signifying, and the thinges signified, be called by the same names. Which thus appeareth to be true, bicause that which before Cōsecration was, and afterward semeth to be bread, is called the flesh, and in like case wine is called the bloud: and so cōtrariwise sometimes the flesh is called the bread, and the bloud is called the wine. What can be said more directly against M. Iewels Sacramentarie Heresie, and more pitchily for cōfirmation of the Catholike doctrine touching this point? And al this M. Iewel hath leaft out.

Transubstantiatio

The same very thing S. Cyprian doth vtter more plainly in other places. In his Treatise of the Supper of our Lorde he hath these most eident wordes. *Panis iste, quem Dominus Discipulus porrigebat, non effigie, sed natura mutatus, Omnipotentia Verbi factus est Caro.* This bread, which our Lorde gaue vnto his Disciples (at his supper) being changed not in shape, but in nature, by the almighty power of the Worde was made flesh.

Cyprianus  
De cena  
Domini.

Lib. 2. Epistola 3.

Againe writing to *Cacilius*, he saith. *Qui magis sacerdos, q̄ Dominus noster Iesus Christus, qui sacrificiū obtulit, et obtulit hoc idē, quod Melchisedech, id est panē et vinum, suū scilicet corpus et sanguinē.* Who is more a Priest, then our Lorde Iesus Christ, who offred vp a Sacrifice, and offred the ve-

the very ſame, that Melchifedech did, that is to ſay, bread and wine, as much to ſay, his owne body and bloude. By theſe places S. Cyprian declareth his minde plainely, what he meaneth by the bread and wine, that Chriſte either gaue at the Supper vnto his Diſciples, or offered vnto his Father to render thanks for the great benefite of his paſſion, ſoothly none other bread and wine, then that which was made by the almighty power of the Woorde, his body and bloude. And behold Reader how vniforme his vtterance is, and how he agreeth with him ſelfe. In the Sermon *De vnōtione Chriſmatis* by M. Jewel with falſe leauing out that which made for the truth, alleged, he ſaith, that *diuers, kindes are reduced into one ſubſtance*, in his Sermon *De cena Domini*, he ſaith, *the bread by the omnipotencie of the Woorde is made fleſh*, ſo bread and fleſh being diuers kindes, are brought to one ſubſtance. There the *things ſignifying, and the things ſignified*, ſaith he, *be called with the ſame names*, as how, I haue before declared. In his Epistle to Cecilius, naming bread and wine, he expoundeth him ſelfe, thus, *ſum ſcili- cet corpus & ſanguinem*, as much to ſay, *his owne body and bloude*. Where the body and bloude beare the names of bread and wine. By this it is clearly ſeene, what an impudent and wicked gloſe is that, which M. Jewel incloſeth in his *parentheſis* added by way of expoſition vnto the maimed ſentence of S. Cyprian, wherewith to exclude the body and bloude of Chriſte, the true bread and wine.

What haue you wonne here by S. Cyprian M. Jewel? Who curieth and maimeth the Doctours? Who is now to be aſked, whether he haue the chynecoffe, which in a place

place of your Reply with out cause you twite me of?  
 What kinde of coffe I shal cal this, I wote not, I feare me  
 the il mater of it lyeth not in your chyne, a place so farre  
 from the harte, but in the harte it selfe. For were not the  
 same by Satans worke festred with the corruption of he-  
 refie, you had not ben letted, as with a coffe, from bring-  
 ing forth the later parte of S. Cyprians saying, whose  
 beginning you falsly abuse to obscure the cleare truthe.  
 Who so euer thus coffeth, I wil not say, he hath the  
 chynecoffe, as you ieast, but verely (sauing my charitie)  
 that he coffeth as like an heretique, as a rotten yew cof-  
 feth like a sheepe.

Laſte of al, whereas he ſaith, that I am reprooued of  
*vntruth and folie* by S. Paule for ſaying, that *Chriſte real-  
 ly ſacrificed him ſelfe at two ſeuerall times; and twiſe really  
 ſhed his bloude, only vpon myne owne warrant: he maketh*  
 no leſſe then three lyes within three lines. For neither  
 ſaid I in this place, that Chriſte twiſe really ſhed his  
 bloude, nor onely vpon myne owne warrant ſaid I, that  
 Chriſte ſacrificed his body and bloud twiſe, bicauſe I had  
 the authoritie of Heſychins here, as the authoritie of o-  
 ther Fathers before, namely Gregorie Nyſſen, and Theo-  
 phylacte, for my warrant. Nor for ſo ſaying am I repro-  
 ued of any vntruth, or folie, by S. Paule. For my aſſertion  
 is true, notwithstanding any thing that S. Paule ſaith.

Three  
 lyes made  
 by M. Iew  
 wel with  
 in three  
 lines.

Wharthough S. Paule ſay, *M. Iewel, Chriſtus ſemel ob-  
 ſatus eſt ad multorum exhaurendos peccata*, Chriſt was once  
 offered, to take away the ſinnes of manye. Againe, *with  
 one ſacrifice he hath made perfect for euer them that be ſan-  
 ctified*? bicauſe in theſe two ſayings you finde the  
 termes, *one*, and *once*; therefore ſuppoſe you what needes

Heb. 9.

Heb. 10.

FF they



they must reprocue my assertion, auouching that Christ was twise really offered?

Two ob-  
lations  
of one  
body.

It semeth you neuer considered, that there may be two oblations of one body, one bloody, the other vnbloudy: one by his owne vertue meriting, the other applying the merite: the one open to the eyes of al, the other in a mysterie: the one employing death of the thing offred, the other representing and recording the same death. Thus it may be, and yet the one shal not quit exclude the other. And he that shal affirme, the bloody, the meriting, and the open oblation to be but one, shal not reprocue him, that faith, hauing respect to both these Oblations, that they be two, and that the body offered, is twise offered.

Heb. 9.  
Heb. 10.

Euen so standeth the case between that S. Paule saith, and that I say. S. Paule speaketh of the Sacrifice of the Crosse that imployed the death of Christe, and fully merited forgeuenesse of the sinnes of the worlde. Which appeareth by the effect of the oblation added, *ad multorum exhaurienda peccata*, to take away the sinnes of many, and in the other place, *he made them that be sanctified with one oblation persite for euer*. This Sacrifice was offered vppon the Crosse. I speake both of that Sacrifice of the Crosse, and of this which Christ offered at his Supper, and commaunded to be offred in his remembrance vntil he come againe.

Luc. 22.  
1. Cor. 11.

The substance of these two Sacrifices being Christe, is al one. The manner of offering, and ende is diuers. That vpon the Crosse, was painful, bloody, ignominious, and ended in death. This at the Supper, is impaisible, vnbloudy, glorious, and free from death. The ende of that was to deserue, and purchase the saluation of the worlde.



worlde, by paying a raunſom ſuperabundantly ſufficient for the finnes of mankind. And that was done once for al. The ende of this, is to commemorate, and represent the death of Chriſte vnto his Father, and in that commemoration to beſech God forgeuing vs our finnes, to take vs into his fauour through the merites of that death, and to applie the benefite of it vnto them, for whom being as they ought to be, diſpoſed, this Sacrifice is offered.

To proue that Sacrifice made vpon the Croſſe and the merites thereof, there neede none other testimonies, then thoſe which haue ben already cited out of S. Paule. Of this, which was offered and instituted at the Supper, of the vnitie of it with the other, and of the effectes of the ſame, the learned Fathers haue made mention in ſundry places. The oblation it ſelfe, and Institution, and one effecte, S. Cyprian comprehendeth in one ſentence. *Ieſus Chriſtus Dominus noſter ipſe eſt ſummus Sacerdos Dei Patris, & Sacrificium Deo Patri ipſe primus obtulit, & hoc fieri in ſui commemorationem praecepit.* Ieſus Chriſte our Lorde, he is the higheſt Priest of God the Father, and he him ſelfe firſt offered a Sacrifice, and commaunded the ſame to be made in his Remembrance.

Cyprian.  
lib. 2. epi-  
ſtol. 3.

The vnitie of it with the other. in ſubſtance, and the ſame effect that S. Cyprian ſpeaketh of, S. Chryſoſtome moſt plainly vttereth. *Quid ergo nos? &c. What then doo we? Doo we not offer euery day? We doo offer verily, but we doo it for remembrance of his death. And this hoſte (or Sacrifice) is one, not many. How is it one, and not many? Becauſe it was once offered, it was offered ap*

Chryſoſt.  
Hom. 17.  
in epiſt. ad  
Heb.

FF ij

into

into the moſt holy place. But this Sacrifice is a ſampler of that other. The ſelfe ſame do we offer vp alwaies. &c.

An other effecte of this our Sacrifice, that is, the Applying of Chriſtes Paſſion vnto vs, S. Gregorie doth expreſſe ſaying. *Quoties ei hoſtiam ſua Paſſionis offerimus, toties nobis ad abſolutionem noſtram illius Paſſionem reparamus.* At often as we offer vnto him the hoſte of his Paſſion, ſo often do we renewe vnto our ſelues his Paſſion to our abſolution.

Gregor.  
Ham. 37.

And here to answer his ſkoffing Conclusion, I wonder, that ſkoffing at me for ſaying, Chriſte was twiſe ſacrificed, he forgotte, that in the ſelfe ſame Diuiſion a litle before, he alleged a place out of S. Auguſtine, where there is expreſſe mention of two immolations or ſacrifices of Chriſte. S. Auguſtines wordes be plain. *ne ſemel oblatuſ eſt Chriſtus in ſemetipſo? Et ta-*  

Auguſtin.  
Epiſt. 23.

*cramento non tantum per omnes Paſcha ſolemnitatem omni die populis immolatur.* Was not Chriſt ſacrificed in him ſelfe? And yet notwithstanding in ſacrament he is ſacrificed for the people, (ſo it is ſtated, and not is offered vnto the people, as M. Iewell ſayeth) not only through al the ſolemne ſeaſon of Eaſter, but alſo every day.

Why heard you not your ſelfe M. Iewel, reporting this plaine ſaying of S. Auguſtine, that Chriſte is twiſe offered? twiſe (I ſay.) in reſpect of the manner of offering, once openly, in him ſelfe, that is, vpon the Croſſe: and againe in a Sacrament, after which manner he is offered vp every day, whereby the Sacrifice of the Aulter is meant. Chriſt there, and Chriſte here is ſacrificed, for the ſubſtance of both Sacrifices is Chriſte. Of that you doubt

doubte not, of this you should not doubte, beleuing him, who said, *This is my body.*

Thus then we answer your scornful absurditie. *One and Two*, and *Once and Twise*, may thus both be conceiued to be said of one thing in this singular Mysterie in diuers respectes. If *Sacrifice* signifie the thing sacrificed, and also the Acte of sacrificing: then whereas *One body* and *One Christe*, was sacrificed, yet the Sacrifices were *Two*. There haue we *One*, and *Two*. Againe Christ was vnbloudely sacrificed at the Supper, and but once bloudily vpon the Crosse. So he was in respect of diuers manners of offering, *Once* and *Twise* offered. Yet in respect of the thing offered or sacrificed, it was *One Sacrifice*, *One offering*, *One Christe*. Thus to a faithfull the Catholike Church, who hath subdued his vn-  
derstanding vnto faith, it appeareth sufficiently, how in a consideration, *One*, and *Two*, and *Once*, and *Twise*, *M. Iewel* skoffeth, may both be said of one thing. He is ouertaken, and founde vnable to answer the  
of *Hesychius*, the substance of this Diuision.

The. 7. Diuision.

The Answer.

AND at the same very instant of tyme ( which is here further to be added, as a necessarie point of Christian doctrine ) we must vnderstande that Christe offered him selfe in Heauen inuisibly ( as concerning man ) in the sight of his Heauenly Father, and that from that time forewarde that Oblation of

FF ij

Christe

into the most holy place. But this Sacrifice is a sampler of that other. The selfe same do we offer vp alwaies. &c.

Gregor.  
Ham. 37.

An other effecte of this our Sacrifice, that is, the Applying of Christes Passion vnto vs, S. Gregorie doth expresse saying. *Quoties ei hostiam sua Passionis offerimus, toties nobis ad absolutionem nostram illius Passionem reparamus.* As often as we offer vnto him the hoste of his Passion, so often do we renewe vnto our selues his Passion to our absolution.

Augustin.  
Epist. 23.

And here to answer his scoffing Conclusion, I wonder, that scoffing at me for saying, Christe was twise sacrificed, he forgotte, that in the selfe same Diuision a litle before, he alleged a place out of S. Augustine, where there is expresse mention of two immolations or sacrificings of Christe. S. Augustines wordes be plaine. *Nō, ne semel oblatuſ est Christus in ſemē ipſo? Et tamen in Sacramento non tantum per omnes Paſchæ ſolemnitateſ, ſed etiam omni die populis immolatur.* Was not Christe once sacrificed in him selfe? And yet notwithstanding in a Sacrament he is sacrificed for the people, (so it is to be translated, and not is offered vnto the people, as M. Iewels falsely translateth it) not only through al the solempne feastes of Easter, but also euery day.

Why heard you not your selfe M. Iewel, reporting this plaine saying of S. Augustine, that Christe is twise offered? twise (I say.) in respect of the manner of offering, once openly, in him selfe, that is, vpon the Crosse: and againe in a Sacrament, after which manner he is offered vp euery day, whereby the Sacrifice of the Altar is meant. Christ there, and Christe here is sacrificed, for the substance of both Sacrifices is Christe. Of that you doubt

doubte not, of this you should not doubte, beleuing him, who said, *This is my body.*

Thus then we answer your scorneful absurditie. *One and Two*, and *Once and Twise*, may thus both be conceiued to be said of one thing in this singular Mysterie in diuers respectes. If *Sacrifice* signifie the thing sacrificed, and also the Acte of sacrificing: then whereas One body and One Christe, was sacrificed, yet the Sacrifices were Two. There haue we One, and Two. Againe Christ was vnbloudely sacrificed at the Supper, and but once bloudily vpon the Crosse. So he was in respect of diuers manners of offering, Once and Twise offered. Yet in respecte of the thing offered or sacrificed, it was One Sacrifice, One offering, One Christe. Thus to a faithful man of the Catholike Church, who hath subdued his vnderstanding vnto faith, it appeareth sufficiently, how in a due consideration, One, and Two, and Once, and Twise, wherat M. Iewel skoffeth, may both be said of one thing. Thus he is ouertaken, and founde vnable to answer the place of Hefychius, the substance of this Diuision.

The. 7. Diuision.

The Answer.

ANd at the same very instant of tyme ( which is here further to be added, as a necessarie pointe of Christian doctrine ) we must vnderstande that Christe offered him selfe in Heauen inuisibly ( as concerning man ) in the sight of his Heauenly Father, and that from that time forewarde that Oblation of

FF ij

Christe



Christe in Heauen was neuer intermitted, but continueth alwaies for our attonement with God, and shal without ceasing endure vntil the ende of the worlde.

Heb. 9.

For as S. Paule saith, Iesus hath not entred into Temples made with bandes, the samplers of the true Temples, but into Heauē it self, to appeare now to the countenance of God for vs. Nowe as this Oblation and Sacrifice of Christe endureth in Heauen continually, for as much as he is risen from the dead, and ascended into heauen with that Bodie, which he gaue to Thomas to feele, bringing in thither his Bloude, as Hesychius saith, and bearing the markes of his woundes, and there appeareth before the face of God with that Thornepricke, Naileboarded, Spearepearsed, and otherwise wounded, rent, and torne Body for vs: (wherby we vnderstand the vertue of his Oblation on the Crosse euer enduringe, not the Oblation it selfe with renewing of paine, and sufferāce continued) so we do perpetually celebrate this Oblation and Sacrifice of Christes very body and bloud in the Masse, in remembraunce of him, commaunded so to do, vntil his comminge.

Lib. 1 c. 4.

Wherein our Aduersaries so foolishly, as wickedly scoffe at vs, as though we sacrificed Christe againe, so as he was Sacrificed on the Crosse, that is; in Bloudy manner. But we doo not so Offer, or Sacrifice Christe againe: but that Oblation of him in the Supper, and  
ours in

ours in the Masse, is but one Oblation, the same Sacrifice, for this cause by his Diuine ordinaunce least vnto vs, that as the Oblatiō once made on the Crosse continually endureth, and appeareth before the face of God in Heauen for our behalfe, continued not by new suffering, but by perpetual intercession for vs: So the memorie of it may euer vntil his second comming be kept amongst vs also in earth, and that thereby we may apply and bring vnto vs through Faith the great benefits, which by that one Oblation of him selfe on the Crosse he hath for vs procured, and daily doth procure.

Iewel.

At the same very instāt of time, saith M. Harding, when Christ was sacrificed vpon the Crosse, he offered vp him self also in Heauen in the sight of his heavenly Father. Which thing he enlargeth Rhetorically vwith a Tragical Description of a Thornepricke, Nailes boarded, Spearepearsed, and otherwise rente, and Torne Body. And this saith he, is a necessary point of Christiā doctrine: And that he auoucheth constantly, albeit vwithout the vwordē, or vvittnesse of any Ancient vvriter, only vpon his ovvne credit. Vwhereof also growveth some suspicion, that his Stoare of olde Recardes, is not so plenteous, as it is supposed.

But vwhere he saith, Christ was thus Inuisibly sacrificed in Heauen, I marueile, he saith not likevvise, that Pilate, Annas, Caiphas, the Souldiers, and the tourmentours vvere likevvise in Heauen to make this Sacrifice. For vwithout this Companie Christes Bloude vvas not shead: And without Sheadding of Bloude, S. Paule saith, There is no Sacrifice for Remission of Sinne. This Fable is so vaine, that, I beleeue, M. Harding him selfe is not vvell hable, to expounde his ovvne meaning. Origen saith, There vvere some in his time, that thought, That

Diuis. 7.

A Reioindre to M. Iewels Replie

*Origen. in  
epist. ad  
Rom. lib.  
5. cap. 6.* That, as Christ was Crucified in this worlde for the liuing, so he  
should afterwarde suffer, and be Crucified in the worlde to come  
for the deade. But that Christ *was thus Thornepricke, Nailebearde,  
Spearepearsed, and Crucified in Heauē, I thinke, noman euer saw, or said,  
but M. Hardinge. The Apostles, the Euangelistes, the Olde Doctours,  
and Ancient Fathers neuer knew it. 3. Paule saith, Semel seipsum ob-  
tulit: Once he offered vp him selfe: Semel introiuit in Sancta:  
Heb. 7. Once he entred into the holy place. And therefore hanging vpon the  
Heb. 9. Crosse, and yelding vp the Ghost, he said, Consummatum est, It is fi-  
nished, This Sacrifice is persutely wrought for euer. This onely Sacrifice  
of Christ the Sonne of God the Scriptures acknowlege, and none other.*

Harding.

In this Diuision M. Iewels Replie containeth litle,  
that is worthy to be answered. Yet least more substance  
of mater should be thought to be in it, then is in deede:  
with some fewe woordes the vanitie of it is to be de-  
tected.

*The con-  
tentes of  
M. Iewels  
Replie in  
the 7. Di-  
uision.*

First, he skoffeth at an absurditie of his owne Deuise  
by his false reporte attributed to me, as though I had vt-  
tered it.

Secondly, he affirmeth that noman denied, which is  
altogether impertinent, that Christes Sacrifice vppon the  
Crosse remaineth stil in force.

Thirdly, he findeth fault with an Auncient Prayer v-  
ted to be said in the Masse.

Fourthly, he goeth about by a sonde reason to shewe,  
the Sacrifice of the Aulter, not to be the same that was  
offered vpon the Crosse.

For answer to his first parte, I desire no more, but that  
the wordes of my booke be circumspectly reade ouer,  
and considered. Which done, I doubt not but the reader  
shal

shall easily espie the lightnesse of his Replie, and the vanitie of his skoffes. For proufe that our Sauour Christe appeareth in heauen before the face of his Father, with his rent and torne body for vs, partely in my Answer I touched a testimony taken out of *Hesychius*, as there it is to be sene: and harde it was not other testimonies to haue brought. If I wist that would satisfie him, and bring him to recant, and returne vnto the catholique faith: I would gladly proue that point with some good number of the olde Learned Fathers. But doubting much thereof, I thinke in a mater so generally beleued and confessed, a fewe testimonies may suffice.

First, *Hesychius* saith thus, *Cicatrices portans Passionum, à mortuis resurrexit, unde & suum corpus palpan- dum Thomas prauit, atque ita in celos ascendit*. Christe rose againe from the dead bearing with him the skarres of his stripes and woundes. For so he offered his owne body to Thomas to feele it, and so he ascended into heauen.

That Christe appeareth before the Father in heauen with his wounded body. *Hesychius* in *Leuit.* lib. 1. c. 4.

Nexte S. Cyprians wordes be plaine. *Semper reseruata in corpore plaga salutis humana exigunt precium, & obedientia donatiuum requirunt*. The woundes reserued styl in Christes body, doo demaunde the paiment of Mannes saluation, and require the rewarde of his obedience. Now what were the woundes, that Christe receiued in his body at the time when he suffered his Passion, but the prickinges of the Thornes, the boarings of the Nails, and the pearfing of the Souldiours speare? If these woundes be reserued alwaies in his body, and claime for paiment to be made, which paiment is the saluation of Mankinde, as S. Cyprian saith: why ma-

*Cyprian. de baptismo Christi.*



keth M. Iewel ſo much a doo for that I ſaid, that Chriſte appeareth continually before the face of God, with that thornepricke, naileboarded, ſpearepearſed, and otherwiſe wounded, rent, and torne body for vs?

And whereas he calleth this a *Rhetorical enlarging of the thing with a Tragical deſcription*: if it were ſo, what euil is therein committed? Do not the beſt learned Fathers oftentimes to moue deuotion, and compaſſion, uſe Rhetorical amplifications, and much more vehement ſpeeches? Doth not S. Cyprian in the place aboue mentioned, tell vs of certaine wordes, *qua emolliunt animum, accenduntq; deuotionis affectum*, which doo ſoften and ſupple our mynde, and enkindle the affection of deuotion in vs? If I had ſuch a motion, when I wrote thoſe woordes, M. Iewel ought not to ſcorne, and ſkoſſe at it.

Cyprianus  
ibidem.

An other learned Father touching the appearing of Chriſte in heauen before his Father with ſuch a body, writeth thus. Theophylaſte I meane, who, though he be not one of the moſt aunciât, yet reporteth that which he learned of the olde learned Fathers of the Greke Church: and ſo reporteth it, as he may ſeme to expounde what S. Cyprian meant, by claiming the paiment or reward of Mans ſaluation. Theſe be his woordes.

Theophyl. *Etiam num vnâ cum corpore quod pro nobis immolauit, apud in epistol. Deum & patrem intercedit, hoc est, quas pro nobis pertulit ad Hebr. afflictiones, ut multum commoueat, proponit etiam sine voce, cap. 5. re ipsa nimirum patri loquens: Pro humana natura filius tuus ego sustinui hac: misere igitur horum, pro quibus ego pati & mori sustinui.* Chriſte euen now by his body, which he ſacrificed for vs, with God and his Father maketh in-

ter-



tercession, that is to say, he setteth forth to the intent he may much moue him the afflictions which he suffered for vs, without voice, euen by deede it selfe speaking vnto the Father (in this wise) I, which am thy Sonne haue suffered these thinges for mankinde: haue mercie therefore of them, for whom I haue susteined to suffer and dye.

What other thing in effect doo my wordes importe, which M. Iewel so much ieasteth at, and saith I speake them vpon myne owne credit onely without witnesse of any Auncient writer: then that was spoken so long fithens by Hesychius, S. Cyprian, and Theophylacte? For as concerning S. Chrysostome (who saith no lesse, *Chrysosto. in caput. 9 ad Hebra. Homi. 17.* though in fewer wordes, *Cum Sacrificio ascendit, quod posuit propitiare Patrem*, Christ ascended into heauen with the Sacrifice, that was hable to pacifie the Father) and other auncient Fathers, by which they meane the body that suffred vpon the Crosse: bicause they speake it more darkely, here I omit to recite them. If then M. Iewels humour be suche, as he must needes please him selfe in mocking and skoffing, let him consider how it becommeth him to skoffe at Hesychius, S. Cyprian, Theophylacte, S. Chrysostome, and other holy and learned Fathers.

That Christe was thus inuisibly sacrificed in heauen, I say not: it is your false reporte M. Iewel, let my booke be trial. This is your common woonte, with shifting of your wordes in my wordes place, to frame an absurde saying, and thereat to exercise the talent of your skoffing. Wherein you fight but with your owne shadow, you touche not my person.

Onely I ſaid, that Chriſte offered him ſelfe in hea-  
uen, when he was crucified on earth, reade my wordes  
who liſte. And that I ſaid is true. And it is none other  
thing, then was ſaid by *Hefychius* aboue a thouſand yeres  
*Hefych. in* paſte. Whoſe wordes theſe be. *Quo tempore vitulus*  
*Leuit. lib.* *immolabatur in inferioribus, eo tempore ut Pontifex ipſe*  
*2. cap. 4.* *sibi Sacrificium offerebat in cælo.* At what time the Calfe  
(that is to ſay, Chriſte) was ſacrificed beneathe in the  
earth, at the ſame time Chriſte as the high Biſhop, him  
ſelfe offered vp Sacrifice to him ſelfe in heauen.

As for your mery obiection of *Pilate, Annas, Cai-  
phas, the Souldiours, and Tourmentours*, of whom you  
maruel, I ſaid not, that *they were like wiſe in heauen to  
make this Sacrifice*: you might haue ſemed to haue ſome  
reaſon, if I had ſaid, or meant, that *this Sacrifice* was  
made in heauen, as you by falſifying my Answer beare  
the vnware Reader in hande I ſaid. *This Sacrifice*, I ſay,  
by which you meane the viſible, paineful, and bloody  
Sacrifice, that was made vpon the Croſſe, and not in  
heauen: *This Sacrifice*, wherein Chriſtes Bloude was  
ſhed, *without which companie* (ſay you) *it was not ſhed.*  
And yet where it was ſhed, I trow you can not proue,  
that *Pilate, Annas, and Caiphas* were in the companie  
of the Souldiours that ſhed it.

Therefore where you ſay thus, *That Chriſte was  
thus Thornepricke, Naileboarde, Spearepearsed, and Cru-  
cified in Heauen, I thinke noman euer ſaw, or ſaid, but M.  
Harding*: I answer, that *M. Harding* neuer ſaid it, as he  
referreth al to his booke for trial, and I thinke, noman  
is ſo impudent, as in ſo plaine a matter ſo to belye him,  
but *M. Jewel*.

With

With what eyes did you reade my booke in this very place? Or thinke you other men haue not eyes to see these expresse wordes there put in by a *paræthesis*, to take away this very fonde cauil that you make, *Whereby we vnderstand the vertue of his oblation on the Crosse euer enduring, not the oblation it selfe with renning of paine, and sufferance continued?* This once espied by the Reader, how doth not al your skoffing lose his grace, and set forth your impudencie of lying?

And therefore you spende labour in vaine, to proue that is not denied: that Christe *once offered up him selfe*, *Hebre. 7.* and *once entred into the holy place*. Which is true, once through shedding of his bloude. Yet that Oblation neuerthelesse endureth for euer, and he with that very broken and torne body stil appeareth to the countenance of God in Heauen, making intercession for vs. And there, when we haue synned, if we repent, and cal vpon him, *he is a Propitiation for our sinnes*, as S. Iohn saith, *1. Ioan. 2.* not by a newe shedding of bloude, but by vertue of his bloude once shed vpon the Crosse, and of his Passion. Vnto whiche manner of Oblation and appearing before the face of the Father, whiche hath continued from the houre of his Passion to this time, and shal continue to the last day: the companie of Pilate, Annas, Caiphas, the Souldiours and Tormentous, as you skoffe, is not necessary. They are appointed an other place, where is *weeping and gnashings of teeth*, where you *Luc. 13.* are sure to haue your parte with them, onlesse you repent, and returne vnto the Catholique Church.

Iewel.

Howbeit, like as the Prayers, that Christe once made, and the Doctrine, that he once taught, remaine stil ful, and effectual, as at the first: euen so the Sacrifice, that Christ once made vpon the Crosse, remaineth stil in ful force, effectual, and persite, and endureth for euer.

Hebre. 7. Therefore S. Paule saith, Christe hath an euerlasting Priesthode, and liueth stil, that he may stil pray for vs. And therefore God the Father saith vnto him, and to none other, either man, or Angel, or Archangel, Tu es Sacerdos in æternū: Thou art a Priest for euer. And therefore S. Chrysostome compareth this Sacrifice to a most soueraine salue, that beinge once laide to the wounde, healeth it cleane, and needeth no more laicing on. Likewise S. Cyprian saith, Nec Sacerdotij eius pœnituit Deum: quoniam Sacrificium, quod in Cruce obtulit, sic in beneplacito Dei constat acceptabile, & perpetua virtute consistit, vt non minus hodie in conspectu Patris Oblatio illa sit efficax, quàm ea die, qua de saucio latere Sanguis, & Aqua exiuit: & semper reseruata in Corpore plagæ salutis Humanæ exigant pretium: It neuer repented God of Christes Priestthode: For the Sacrifice, that he offered vpon the Crosse, is so acceptable in the good wil of God, and so standeth in continual strength and Vertue, that the same Oblation is no lesse acceptable this daie in the sight of God the Father, then it was that day, when Bloud, and VVater ranne out of his VVounded side. The Skarres reserued stil in his Bodie, doo weighe the price of the Saluation of man.

Harding.

Now commeth M. Iewel to proue that no man denied. That the Sacrifice of Christe vpon the Crosse continueth stil in force and effectual, as the Prayers that he once made, and the doctrine that he once taught, remaine effectual, as at the first. Al this is true M. Iewel, but how pertaineth it to your purpose? Wil you thereof conclude against vs, and thus reason against the vnbloudy Sacrifice: The vnbloudy

bloudy Sacrifice continueth alwaies in force, *Ergo*, the vnbloudy Sacrifice is superfluous? That is acceptable in the sight of God, *Ergo*, this is vnacceptable and displeasing.

If this be not your Argument, why said you so much for that, which euery faithful man confesseth? If this be your Argument, we require you to learne your Logique better, before you teache vs newe Diuinitie. For whereas there be two thinges true, it is a fonde kinde of reasoning, to conclude the denial of the one, by the affirmation of the other, as I must tel you oftentimes.

This much we confesse also, that onlesse the Sacrifice whereof we speake, were one and the same in substance of the thing offered, with the Sacrifice made vpon the Crosse, though the manner of offering be diuers: it were superfluous, and to God displeasing. For the newe Testament acknowledgeth, nor accepteth none other real and external Sacrifice, but the Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe, which hath succeeded, as S. Augustine, and al the learned Fathers with one consent do confesse, in place of al the olde Sacrifices.

*August. de  
ciuitate  
Dei, li. 17.  
cap. 20.*

Yet you wil reple, and say. If that Sacrifice vpon the Crosse, be styl effectual, and continue in force for euer, what neede is there of this Sacrifice daily made vpon the Aulter?

Concerning this Reple, euery man shal easily satisfie him selfe, if he wil consider it in a like case. Christe once prayed, and that prayer is effectual to this day, and shalbe to the worldes ende. Neuerthelesse we must pray also, if we wil be partakers of his prayer.

Christe washed away the sinnes of the worlde, with  
the



the bloude, that was ſhed out of his body at his Paſſion: Notwithſtanding we muſt, if we wil be ſaued, be baptiſed, that we be made cleane from Original ſinne, and from Actual too, if we haue committed any before our Baptiſme.

Hebr. 10. *Chriſte hath for euer perſited them that be ſanctified,*  
2. Cor. 7. *With one oblation.* Yet S. Paules counſel is, *ut emundemus nos ab omni inquinamento carnis & ſpiritus perſicientes ſanctificationem in timore Dei.* That we cleaſe our ſelues from al filth of fleſh, and ſpирite, perſiting our ſanctification in the feare of God. Here is ſpecial mention made of two perſitinges of our ſanctification, the one belonging to Chriſte, the other to our ſelues. If Chriſte doo perſite, what neede we to perſite?

For the better aſſoiling of this doubt, let vs cal to mynde, what S. Paule writeth in his Epistle to the Corinthians, ſaying, *Dei ſumus adiutores.* We are the helpers of God. What (wil ſome ſay) hath God neede of helpers? Yea truly. His goodnes is ſuche, that he vouchſaueth to take vs to be his helpers, not for any defecte, or vnableneſſe that is in him, but bicauſe he would haue vs to be occupied in his ſeruice, and not to be idel. And therefore he hath appointed certaine meanes and instrumentes to practiſe vs withal, as Faith, Baptiſme, Penance, Faſting, Prayer, Almoſe, and ſpecially a Sacrifice, wherein we may concurre with him, not in the chiefe, firſt, and general cauſe, which alone hath wrought, and daily worketh: but as liuely instrumentes to deriue vnto our ſelues the effecte of that chiefe, firſt, and general cauſe, that as he generally hath deſerued and purchaſed a moſt ful and  
perſite

perfecte saluation for al the worlde, which in it selfe can not be increased, bicause it is perfect, ne can not be diminished, bicause it is infinite: so we ech of vs by his grace vsing and putting in practise the meanes, that he hath appointed, may be made comparteners of the same saluation, which otherwise can not be auailable vnto vs.

It should be ouer longe, and beside my purpose, to stande about the prouing, that Baptisme, Penaunce, Prayer, Fasting, Almoſe ioyned with Faith, that worketh through Charitie, be meanes to deriue vnto vs the effect of Christes death. It shal suffice to prooue the Sacrifice of Christes body and blood vpon the Aulter, to be one of those meanes.

That this Sacrifice is a meane to deriue the effecte of Christes death vnto vs. Gregor. Hom. 37.

This truth is prooued not onely by that which I haue before alleged out of S. Gregorie, who saith, that *as ofte we offer vp vnto him the hoste of his Passion, so ofte we renew vnto our selues his Passion for our absolution*: but also by that which S. Augustine writeth in a Prayer, which is to be founde in a treatise of deuoute Prayers intituled, *Manuale*. Where asking of God a contrite harte, and a fountaine of teares, specially at the time when he prayeth, he saith thus. *Dum sacris Altaribus licet indignus assisto, cupiens tibi offerre illud mirabile & caeleste Sacrificium omni reuerentia & deuotione dignum, quod tu Domine Deus meus sacerdos immaculate instituisti, & offerre precepisti, in commemorationem tuae charitatis, mortis scilicet & Passionis pro salute nostra, pro quotidiana nostra fragilitatis reparatione.* Geue me I besech thee o Christe Iesu, contrition of harte, &c. Whiles I, although vnworthy, doo stande at the holy Aulter, desirous to offer vp

August. in Manuali. cap. 11.

the bloude, that was ſhed out of his body at his Paſſion: Notwithſtanding we muſt, if we wil be ſaued, be baptiſed, that we be made cleane from Original ſinne, and from Actual too, if we haue committed any before our Baptiſme.

Hebr. 10.

2. Cor. 7.

*Chriſte hath for euer perfited them that be ſanctified, with one oblation.* Yet S. Paules counſel is, *ut emundemus nos ab omni inquinamento carnis & ſpiritus perficientes ſanctificationem in timore Dei.* That we cleaſe our ſelues from al filth of fleſh, and ſpirite, perfiting our ſanctification in the feare of God. Here is ſpecial mention made of two perfitinges of our ſanctification, the one belonging to Chriſte, the other to our ſelues. If Chriſte doo perfite, what neede we to perfite?

1. Cor. 3.

For the better aſſoiling of this doubt, let vs cal to mynde, what S. Paule writeth in his Epistle to the Corinthians, ſaying, *Dei ſumus adiutores.* We are the helpers of God. What (wil ſome ſay) hath God neede of helpers? Yea truly. His goodnes is ſuche, that he vouchefaueth to take vs to be his helpers, not for any defecte, or vnhableneſſe that is in him, but bicauſe he would haue vs to be occupied in his ſeruice, and not to be idel. And therfore he hath appointed certaine meanes and instrumentes to practiſe vs withal, as Faith, Baptiſme, Penance, Faſting, Prayer, Almoſe, and ſpecially a Sacrifice, wherein we may concurre with him, not in the chiefe, firſt, and general cauſe, which alone hath wrought, and daily worketh: but as liuely instrumentes to deriue vnto our ſelues the effecte of that chiefe, firſt, and general cauſe, that as he generally hath deſerued and purchaſed a moſt ful and perfite

perfitte saluation for al the worlde, which in it selfe can not be increased, bicause it is perfitte, ne can not be diminished, bicause it is infinite: so we ech of vs by his grace vsing and putting in practise the meanes, that he hath appointed, may be made comparteners of the same saluation, which otherwise can not be auailable vnto vs.

It should be ouer longe, and beside my purpose, to stande about the prouing, that Baptisme, Penance, Prayer, Fasting, Almoſe ioyned with Faith, that worketh through Charitie, be meanes to deriue vnto vs the effect of Christes death. It shal suffice to prooue the Sacrifice of Christes body and bloud vpon the Aulter, to be one of those meanes.

This truth is prooued not onely by that which I haue before alleged out of S. Gregorie, who saith, that *as ofte as we offer vp vnto him the hoste of his Passion, so ofte we renew vnto our selues his Passion for our absolution*: but also by that which S. Augustine writeth in a Prayer, which is to be founde in a treatise of deuoute Prayers intituled, *Manuale*. Where asking of God a contrite harte, and a fountaine of teares, specially at the time when he prayeth, he saith thus. *Dum sacris Altaribus licet indignus assisto, cupienstibi offerre illud mirabile & caeleste Sacrificium omni reuerentia & deuotione dignum, quod tu Domine Deus meus sacerdos immaculate instituisti, & offerre precepisti, in commemorationem tuae charitatis, mortis scilicet & Passionis pro salute nostra, pro quotidiana nostra fragilitatis reparatione.* Geue me I besech thee o Christe Iesu, contrition of harte, &c. Whiles I, although vnworthy, doo stande at the holy Aulter, desirous to offer vp

That this Sacrifice is a mean to deriue the effecte of Christes death vnto vs. Gregor. Hom. 37.

August. in Manuali. cap. 11.



*Luc. 22.*

vnto thee that maruelous and heauenly Sacrifice, worthy of al reuerence and deuotion, which thou Lorde my God vnspotted Priest didst institute, and commaundedst to offer vp for a remembrance of thy charitie, that is to say, of thy death and passion for our saluation, and for the daily repairing of our frailtie.

Nowe whereas this Sacrifice offered vp for the remembraunce of Christes death, is here said to be profitable to saue vs, and to repaire our daily ruines happening vnto vs through our frailtie: in what other sense can it be true, but bicause thereby, as by a soueraigne meane appointed by Christe, some particular effecte of that general and infinite saluation and reparation made vpon the Crosse, is applied vnto our sicke and much decayed soules? And thus it is declared, although not so largely as the worthinesse of the mater requireth, how the Sacrifice of the Auker is auailable and requisite, although the Sacrifice made vpon the Crosse remaine stil in ful force, effectual, and persite, and endure for euer.

*Iewel.*

*But M. Harding condemneth vs al for Foolishe, and VVicked people. For Foolishe, I know not vwhy. Neither is it thought a vvise-mannes parte, either greatly to mislike other mennes vvittes, or ouer-muche to like his owne. How be it, vvho so speaketh, as neuer vvise-man spake, and yet him selfe vnderstandeth not, vvhat he speaketh, as, in this case, it is thought, M. Harding doth, hath no greate cause, in this behalfe, to charge others vvith folie.*

*Harding.*

*M. Iewel is much offended for that I said, our aduersaries no lesse foolishly, then wickedly skoffe at vs, as though*  
*when*



When we celebrate the vnbloudy Sacrifice, we sacrifice Christe againe, so as he was sacrificed vpon the Crosse. But why should you herewith be offended good sir? Is it not a foolish thing to relvs; as ye do, that we shed the bloud of Christe, and doo such violence vnto him at the Altter, as the Souldiours did at the Crosse? Though ye be so malicious as to speake it, yet is there any man so simple, as to beleue it? Who thus speaketh, I trowe he speaketh as foolishly, as he that goeth about to make one beleue the Moone is made of greene cheefe. As that is a foolish perswasion, so is this nolesse foolish, but more malicious. This notwithstanding, why I should cal them foolish, M. Iewel seeth no cause. And no marvel. For a rare thing it is to heare of a foole, that wil acknowledge him selfe to be a foole, or to doo foolishly.

How be it, wheras M. Iewel, and his Companions do cal in question and disputation, whether many thinges, as wel touching this vnbloudy Oblation of the Church, as other pointes, be to be done of our parte, which though not expressly written, yet deliuered from hand to hand be obserued through out the whole worlde, and therefore are presupposed to be reteined, as commended and decreed either by the Apostles them selues, or by General Councils, whose auctoritie in the Church is most holesome: for this cause Saint Augustine condemneth them not of bare folie, but of most insolent madnes. Thus to doo, is a point, *insolentissima insanie*, of most insolent madnes, saith he.

August. ad  
Ianuariū.  
Epist. 118.

If then this be S. Augustines verdite of them for doubting, and reasoning of such things, that be not expressly

written in the Scripture, but be receiued by custome: by what name deserueth M. Iewel to be called, who flatly denieth, and with tongue, penne, and ourwarde force of punishmentes, withstandeth the Sacrifice of the Church offered and instituted by Christe, described in the Gospel, auouched of the olde learned Fathers, frequented through out the whole Catholike Church of all ages, and countries?

Math. 26.

Luc. 22.

1. Cor. 11.

Neither hath M. Iewel sufficient reason to conclude, that either I ouermuch like myne owne witte, or mislike his witte, and his felowes, bicause I said, they skossed foolishly and wickedly at vs, touching this point. He, and they may haue witte ynough, and yet for lacke of grace doo ful foolishly. We reade in the Scriptures of some who haue eyes, yet see not, eares, yet heare not, hartes, yet vnderstand not. So there be that haue witte, yet many times do not wisely, but so as it may be said of them, that fooles haue it in keeping. You haue witte ynough M. Iewel, I denie not, ne enuye not the praise of it: would God a good man had the occupying of it.

Esa. 6.

Math. 13.

Whereas I charged our Aduersaries with folie, and wickednesse, in that they skoffe at vs, as though we sacrificed Christe againe with violent drawing of bloude out of his body, as he was sacrificed vpon the Crosse: M. Iewel vnderstanding him selfe therein touched, hath ful wisely put away from him the blemish of folie, as now it is declared. It remaineth, he purge him selfe, and his felowes, of the crime of wickednesse. The same now he goeth about to doo. But how, and with what reason, it is worth the consideration.

Jewel.

Of the other side, what so euer Mortal man presumeth to offer vp Christe in Sacrifice, and dareth to desire God the Father so fauourably to beholde his owne onely Sonne, as in olde times he behelde the Oblation of Abel, or of Melchisedek, and is not as fraide, therevith to beguile the simple, and to mocke the worlde, as M. Harding doth daily at his Masse: he can not wuel excuse him selfe of open vickednesse.

Harding.

To auoide the crime of wickednesse, he againe fallly accuseth me, and in my person, the whole Catholique Church of the same faulte, as if a theefe being burthened with fellonie by some true man, would thinke him selfe vnburthened of that infamie, by charging the true man with theste on the other side. And what is this greate wickednesse, that he layeth vnto our charge? Forsooth bicause being mortal men we offer vp Christe in Sacrifice, and dare to desire God the Father, pronouncing the auncient Prayer of the Church in the Canon of the Masse fauourably to beholde our oblation, and to accepte it, as he vouchesaues to accepte the giftes of Abel, the Sacrifice of Abraham, and that which Melchisedech offered. For so we doo, and not altogether as M. Jewel reporteth. This is that, whereof he saith, *We beguile the simple, and mocke the worlde.*

This is sufficiently answered before. For vs to offer vp to God the body and bloude of Christe, as executing thereby the plaine commaundement of Christe, who at his laste Supper hauing consecrated his body and bloude, said, *Doo ye this in my Remembrance*: is neither to be- Luc, 22. guile the simple, nor to mocke the worlde. If we did

H H iij

it not,

it not, we should by not doing that we are commaunded to doo, beguile the worlde, and defraude Gods people of the most heauenly and pretious tresoure, that our Lorde leste vnto his Church.

A defence  
of the  
prayer vi  
sed to be  
said in  
the holy  
Canon of  
the Masse

And as touching the Prayer we are taught to make vn- to God, wherein we humbly besech him to accept our oblation of his Sonnes body and bloude, as he accepted the sacrifices of Abel, Abraham, and Melchisedech: ther- in is no doubt made, but God the Father is best pleased with his onely and most dere Sonne Christe Iesus. The feare of our onworthinesse moueth vs so to pray, least that although the thing offered of it selfe be most acceptable, yet the Father through our greuous synnes displeased with vs, wil not admit, and accept that most acceptable Sacrifice to our saluation, but rather to our damnation. Like as it happeth sometimes a Prince to reiecte a very pretious Iuel offered by his enemy, or one that he fauoureth not, not bicause the Iuel misliketh him, but bi- cause the partie that offered it, was his foe, or out of his fauour.

In Cano-  
ne Masse.

And whereas M. Iewel would haue it seme absurde, that the Father should be entreated *with his merciful and fauourable countenance to looke vpon the holy bread of life enerlasting, and the cuppe of perpetual saluation, and to ac- cepte the same, as he vouchesaue to accepte the giftes and Sacrifices of Abel, Abraham, and Melchisedech, ( for so the Priest prayeth at the Masse, and not as M. Iewel to colourable aduantage falsly reporteth it )*: I answer, that happy be we, if for our behalse, he wil so accepte that our Sacrifice, as he did the Sacrifices of those holy men his dere frendes.

Further

Furthermore M. Iewel is not ignorant, if he be so wel learned, as he is thought to be, that the aduerbe of similitude (*Sicuti*) *As*, doth not alwaies signifie a full equalitie, but onely a likenesse in some parte and degree. As for example, it doth in that prayer, which Christe made vnto his Father for his chosen. *Pater sancte serua eos in nomine tuo, quos dedisti mihi, vt sint vnum, sicut & nos.* O Holy Father keepe them in thy name, whom thou hast geuen vnto me, that they may be one, as wee are. In this Prayer Christes meaninge was not, that the electe shoulde be thoroughly in substance al one, as God the Father and God the Sonne be: but one in charitie, wil, and concorde, thinking al one thing, and willing al one thing, as Theophylacte with other Doctours expoundeth the place. And whereas the Scripture saith in the person of God speaking vnto Iosue, *Sicut cum Moyse fui, ita & tecum sum*, As I was with Moyse, euen so I am with the also: It is not meant, that God was with Moyse in no greater and higher degree of power and vertue, then he was with Iosue. For Moyse was admitted vnto a peerlesse frendship with God, and endewed with more special auctoritie, then euer Iosue was, as the Scriptures doo euidently witness.

So doth the Church beseech the Father to looke vpo that holy bread, and cuppe of life and health euerlasting, that is to say, the body and bloude of his Sonne Iesus Christ, with a merciful and cleare countenance, as he did vpo the sacrifices of Abel, Abrahā, and Melchisedel: not that it is mistrusted, least God be lesse, or not infinitely more pleased with the one Sacrifice, then with the other:  
but



See what  
I say touch-  
ing this  
Prayer  
of the Ca-  
non, in  
the last  
Diuisiōn.

but that humbly we thinke, it shalbe wel with vs, if he respectē, beholde, and allowe the ministerie, and deuotion of vs, as farre forth as he did the deuotion of the others. Of this M. Iewel geueth me occasion to speake more, in the last Diuisiōn of this Article.

If M. Iewel had in his harte so much deuoute humilitie, or humble deuotion, as he seemeth to haue deuilish arrogancie, or arrogant deuilishnesse: he would neuer haue accused me, or rather the Church, for vsing this humble and deuoute Prayer in the Masse, which in spite he calleth my Masse, being the common Seruice, and Sacrifice of the whole Church of Christ.

But bicause like an vnkinde and degenerate, or rather a rebellious sonne, he despiseth the auctoritie of his Mother the Church, I wil put him in minde of S. Ambrose, that holy and learned Bishop, and excellent member of the Church, yet doubting whether he wil ought reuerence one, after he hath so insolently contemned them al. Fayne would I vnderstand, with what sope or lye, he is hable to scoure out the spotte of so vaine, wicked, and foolish an opinion, so contrary to that S. Ambrose writeth. Who to prooue that this is the Sacrament, the figure whereof went before, and to shewe how great a Sacrament it is, bringeth in this Prayer vsed in the Masse, and wherein M. Iewel findeth so great beguyling of the simple, mocking of the worlde, and open wickednesse: as a most strong argument. His wordes be these, the same (very few wordes excepted) that be in Canon of the Masse, that so confidently he reproveth both here, and also in the Sermon, wherein he made the first proclamation of his vaine Challenge.

*Sacerdos*

*Sacerdos dicit : Ergo memores gloriosissima eius Pas-*  
*sionis, & ab inferis Resurrectionis, & in cælum Ascensionis,*  
*offerimus tibi hanc immaculatam hostiam, rationabilem ho-*  
*stiam, incruentam hostiam, hunc panem sanctum, & cali-*  
*cem vitæ æternæ, & petimus, & precamur, ut hanc oblationē*  
*suscipias in sublimi altari tuo per manus Angelorum tuorum,*  
*sicut suscipere dignatus es munera pueri tui iusti Abel, & sa-*  
*criticium Patriarchæ nostri Abrahæ, & quod tibi obtulit*  
*summus sacerdos Melchisedech.* The priest saith. There-  
 fore being myndeful of his most glorious Passion, and  
 Resurrection from hell, and of his Ascension into hea-  
 uen, we offer vp vnto thee this vnspotted hoste, this  
 reasonable hoste, this vnbloudy hoste, this holy bread,  
 and cuppe of life euerlasting : And we beseeche, and  
 pray thee, that thou receiue this Oblation in thy Aulter  
 on high, by the handes of thy Angels, as thou vouche-  
 fauedst to receiue the giftes of thy childe Iuste Abel, and  
 the sacrifice of Abraham our Patriarke, and that which  
 Melchisedech the higest Priest offered vp vnto thee.

Lo good Reader, thus prayed S. Ambrose in his  
 Masse, nor for so doing was he euer thought to haue be-  
 gyled the simple, nor to haue mocked the worlde. And  
 the whole Catholique Church hath euer so farre clea-  
 red him of al wickednesse, not onely open, but also pri-  
 uy : that he is holden for a holy Confessour, vncontrol-  
 led Doctour, and strong pillour of the Church, vntil  
 M. Iewel a very begyler of the simple, and mocker of  
 the worlde in deede, came to prie out in his doctrine,  
 and prayer, being also the cōmon prayer of the Church,  
 a heinous wickednesse.

Ambrosius  
 de sacram.  
 lib. 4. cap.  
 6.

Iewel.

*Notwithstandinge this matter is easily answered. For (saith he) we Sacrifice not Christe againe: The Oblation, that Christe made vpon the Crosse, and ours in the Masse, is al one. And this Sacrifice Christe hath commaunded vs to continew vntil his comminge. If M. Harding make the selfe same Sacrifice, that Christe made vpon the Crosse, then is he A Priest after the order of Melchisedeck: And so The king of Iustice: The Prince of Peace: and a Prieste for euer, without Successour. For these titles be incident to the Priesthoode of Melchisedeck: vvhiche neuertheless, I thinke, M. Hardinge of his modestie vvill not acknowlledge. And vvithout the same, he cannot offer vp to God the same Sacrifice, that Christe offered vpon the Crosse.*

*And vvhere he saith, Christe hath commaunded him, and his Fellowes to make, and continew this Sacrifice vntil his comminge, If he had meante simply, and plainely, he vvould haue shewed, either vvhen, or vvhere, or by vvhat vvordes Christe gaue him this Commaundement. For so large a Commission is vvorthy the shewing: And it vvete greate boldnesse, to attempte suche a mater vvithout Commission.*

Harding.

*Last of al commeth M. Iewel to declare the titles, and dignities of Melchisedech, and saith, that M. Harding, that is to say, any Priest of the Catholique Church, can not offer vp the same Sacrifice, that Christe offered vpon the Crosse, bicause he is not a king of Iustice, a Prince of peace, and a Priest for euer vvithout Successour. For these titles (saith he) belong to Melchisedeks Priesthode.*

*Here I must againe warne the Reader to haue a good eye to M. Iewel, and to consider, first that now, as oftentimes before, he frameth an Obiection with his*  
owne

owne wordes , whiche I make not , and replyeth against it, as if it were myne. Nexte , that in case I had said , as he pretendeth I said , neuerthelesse when we say , the Priest offereth the same Sacrifice which Christe offered vpon the Crosse: the substance of the Sacrifice it selfe , that is , the thing sacrificed , which is the body and bloude of Christe , is meant thereby , and not the manner of sacrificing. Of this M.Iewel, and his felowes be not , ne can not be ignorant , being by the Catholiques so oftentimes tolde of it. Yet euer they wil seeme not to knowe it , least their common obiection against the Sacrifice of the Aulter, wherewith they haue neuer done, should appeare friuolous. For they iarre alwaies vpon the false string of the manner of sacrificing, which we touche not, but auouche the same substance of the Sacrifice that was offered vp vpon the Crosse.

If I had swarued so farre from truth and reason , as to say, that I being a Priest do offer vp to God the same Sacrifice, which Christe offered vpon the Crosse , and that in the same manner , and to the same effecte and merite, which is to vsurpe the office that is proper to Christe onely : then with some reason he might haue replied, as he doth: that I were a *Priest after the order of Melchisedech, and so the king of Iustice, the Prince of peace, and a Priest for euer without Successour* . Which titles of right belong to Christe onely.

But now wheras I am farre frō saying, yea also frō thinking any such thing: he replieth with asmuch reason, as if he should tel one of the Iudges of the Realme, who executeth his office vnder the Prince, and by Cōmission frō the Prince, *Sir if you acquit men in Englād, and condēne me*

II y to die,



to die, then are you a King of England: for what greater thing can a King doo, then to saue, and condemne men? And if you be King of England, then of Fraunce also, and of Ireland, and so defendour of the Faith, for these titles belong to the king of England, or who so euer els succedeth in the kingly right. In this case might not that Iudge answer you againe, and say, M. Superintendent, you may talke of your Ministers, and your Ministring matters. You speake ye wote not what. I tel you, I neither acquitte, nor condemne men to die of myne owne power or auctoritie, but vnder the Prince, and by vertue of my Commission from the Prince. And therefore you may go to schoole againe to learne your Logique better, and to make a wiser Argument.

The case betwen Christe, and those that execute the office of Priesthode vnder Christe, standeth in like condition. Albeit in Christe being God, and man, *annointed of God him selfe with the oile of gladnesse aboue his comparteners*, as in the Psalme it is of him prophesied, and being the highest Priest, the foresaid conditions be most persitely accomplished, that is to say, though by nature he be the King of Iustice, the Prince of Peace, and the most true Priest for euer after the order of Melchisedech, without any other to succede him: Yet it is not necessary, the same soueraine conditions in al pointes be required in those that be made Priestes from among men, and be Priestes vnder Christe, or, as Eusebius speaketh, *οὐ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἱερεὺς*, *Priestes out of him*. For whom it is sufficiēt, they be lausfully chosen and ordered, to be Ministers vnder Christ of his Mysteries, and of his Priesthood, by meane of whom, and through whom  
Christe

*Psal. 44.*

*Me offer  
this Sa-  
crifice  
and be  
Priestes  
after the  
order of  
Melchise-  
dek vnder  
Christ*

*Euseb. de  
demonstr.  
lib. 5.*



Christe doth celebrate after the manner of Melchisech the things that appertine vnto the Sacrifice that is among men, euen vnto this day, as Eusebius saith. Marke Reader, Eusebius saith, after the manner of Melchisedek, expounding the meaning of the worde, Order, where it is said of Christe, that he is a Prieste after the Order of Melchisedek. Whereby we vnderstand, that he was a Priest, not onely after the dignitie of Melchisedek, that is to say, bicause he was a King of peace, and of iustice, without father, without mother, without Genealogie, neither hauing beginning of daies, nor ending of life: but also after the rite, and manner of Melchisedek, whose Sacrifice was in bread and wine. After whiche manner, Christe did at the Supper, and we doo now at the Aulter, offer his body and bloud, vnder the formes of bread and wine.

And this much that auncient and learned Doctour would to be considered, as the wonderful ende and performance of the Oracle pronounced of Christe, *Thou art a Priest for euer after the Order of Melchisedek*, bicause he cōtinueth his Priesthood by the ministerie of Priestes. Theophylacte expoundeth it likewise. Oecumenius also hauing conceiued thereof the same sense, saith, *He would neuer haue said In aeternum, for euer, hauing respect vnto the oblation that was but once offred (vpon the Crosse) but referring consideration vnto the Priestes, that be at this present, by whom as by meanes, Christe doth sacrifice, and is sacrificed; who also in his Mystical Supper deliuered vnto them the manner of such Sacrifice.*

And the later parte of this Testimonie doth make answer in my behalfe vnto you M. Iewel burthening me

II. iij. with.

Τὸ τοῦ  
Μελχισέ-  
δὲκ τὸ  
πρὸς τὰ  
ἄνθρω-  
ποις ἱερε-  
ῖας ὡς ἐστὶ  
καὶ νῦν ἐν  
πίστεϊ.

Psal. 109.

Theophy-  
lactus.

In epist.  
ad Heb.

cap. 5.

Qui quo-  
tidie offer-  
tur per  
Dei Mini-  
stros.

Ibidem.

with no simple and plaine dealing, for that I haue not shewed, when, and where, or by what woordes Christe gaue commaundement to make and continue this Sacrifice. By OEcumenius you haue heard it tolde, that Christe deliuered vnto Priestes at his last Supper the manner of this Sacrifice. And if it had liked you to haue looked backe, or to haue remembred, what I had said in the: 5. Diuision, you would neuer so without cause haue reprehended me for not telling, when, and where, and by what wordes Christe gaue commaundement to make and continue this Sacrifice. For there euen in the beginning, the time when, the place where, and the woordes by which this Sacrifice was instituted, and commaunded, be plainely expresse. Now therefore that our Commission may so easily be shewed, twite vs no more of great boldenesse, as though we attempted to celebrate so high and so diuine Mysteries without Commission.

The. 8. Diuision.

The Answer.

**N**Owe for further proufe of the offering and Sacrificing of Christe of those wordes of our Lord,  
Doo this in my remembraunce, to recite some testimonies of the Fathers: First, Dionysius S. Paules scholar, and Bisshop of Athenes, writeth thus: Quo- circa reuerenter simul, & ex Pontificali officio, post sacras diuinorum operum laudes, quod hostiam salutarem, quę super ipsum est, litet, se excusat,

Dionys. ec-  
cles. Hier.  
p. 1. cap. 3.

cusat, ad ipsum primò decenter exclamans, Tu dixisti: Hoc facite in meam cōmemorationem. Wherefore the Bishop (saith he) reuerently, and according to his Bishoply office, after the holy prayes of Gods workes, excuseth himselfe, that he taketh vpon him to offer that healthful Sacrifice, whiche is aboue his degree, and worthinesse, crying out first vnto him, in seemely wise, Lorde thou hast commaunded thus, sayinge, Doo this in my remembraunce. By these wordes he confesseth, that he coulde not be so hardy, as to offer vp Christe vnto his Father, had not Christe him selfe so commaunded, when he said, Doo this in my remembraunce. This is the doctrine, touching this Article, that S. Paule taught his Scholars, which M. Jewel denieth.

Jewel.

Here maist thou, gentle Reader, easily see, that M. Hardinge, either had not that abundance of Stoare, vvhreeof notvwithstandinge he hath made vs so large a promise, or els had no greate regard vnto his choise. For Dionysius hath no tokē, or inkling of any such sacrificing of the Sonne of God vnto his Father. But clearely & in most plaine wise he sheweth the differēce, that is betwene the Sacrifice of the Crosse, and the Sacrifice of the holy Communion. These be his vvordes, The priest extolleth those thinges, that Christe wrought in his Fleashe vpon the crosse, for the saluation of mankind: and with Spiritual eies, beholding the Spiritual vnderstandinge thereof, draweth neare to the Figuratiue Sacrifice of the same. Here Dionysius calleth not the Ministration of the Holy Mysteries, the Sacrificinge of Christe vnto his Father, as M.

Dionys. ec-  
clesiast. Hi-  
erar. cap. 3.  
πρὸς συν-  
βολικὴν ἐ-  
ρουργίαν.

Harding

Hardinge woulde force vs to beleue, but a Figuratiue Sacrifice, that Pachymer is, a Figure, or a Signe of that greate Sacrifice. And Pachymeres the in .3. cap. Paraphrast expoundeth the same vvordes in this wise: πρὸς τὸ ἄγιον, Ecclesiast. καὶ ποταμὸν ἔρχεται: He commeth to the Breade, and the Hierarch. Cuppe.

Then the Priest, saith Dionysius, after certaine Praiers, and Holy Songes, excuseth him selfe, as not vvorthy to make that Sacrifice: and pronounceth these vvordes out vvith a loude voice, Tu dixisti &c. Thow hast saide, Doo this in my remembrance. Hereof M. Hardinge concludeth thus.

The Priest excuseth him selfe, Ergo, He Offereth vp the Sonne of God vnto his Father. A yonge Sophister wvould neuer so vnskillfully frame his argumentes. Othervvise the Respondēt might easily saie, Nego Consequentiam, & Consequens. For vvhat order, or sequele is there in this Reason? Horve may this Antecedente, and this Consequente agree togeather?

M. Harding knowveth, there be other sundrie causes, vvheresfore the Priest should excuse his unvvorthinesse, and not this onely, that he imagineth. The Priest in the Liturgie, or Communion, that beareth the name of S. Basile, praieth thus: Fac nos idoneos, vt tibi offeramus Sacrificium Laudis: Make vs meete, to offer vnto thee (not Chrifte thine onely Sonne, but) the Sacrifice of praise. In like manner Nazianzene saith, Howe can they, or dare they offer vnto God, (he saith not, The Bodie of Chrifte Really, and in deede but) the Figure of these greate Mysteries? But M. Hardinge beinge vterly voide of other reasons, prooueth his imagined Sacrifice of the Sonne of God, ouely by the unvvorthinesse of the Priest.

Liturgia  
Basili.

Nazian.in

Apologet.

τὴν τῶν

μετέλλων

μυστηρίων

ἀντίτυπον

Ecclesiast.

Hierar.ca.

2. Απο-

ελέγας ὅ

τι πρὸς γ

μαῖος με-

τέρος, φρί-

σσει, καὶ

ἀμύχανος.

This is the iust Iudgement of God, that vvho so endeouoreth him selfe to deceiue, and blinde others, shalbe deceuiued, and blinde him selfe. For Dionysius vsseth the very like vvordes, speakinge of the Sacramente of Baptisme: Sacerdos cogitans negotij magnitudinem, horret, atque hæsitat. The Priest consideringe the weight of the mater, is in an horroure, and in an agonie. Likewise S. Basile excuseth his ovvne unvvorthinesse of beainge the Vvorde of God: Quæ auris digna est magnitudine earum rerum, quæ dicuntur? Cogitemus, quisnam ille sit,



ille sit, qui nos affatur, what care is worthy to heare the Maiestie of these things? Let vs consider, who it is, that speaketh to vs, *S. Paule speakinge of the glorie, & puissance of the Gospel, in the ende, in respect of his owne vnnorthinesse, vseth this exclamation, Et ad hæc quis idoneus? And who is meere to publishe, and to speake these things? S. Cyprian saith, VVee are not woorthy to looke vp into Heauen, and to speake vnto God. O, saith he, what merciful fauoure of our Lorde is this, that wee maie call God our Father: and euen as Christe is Goddes Sonne, so maie wee be called the children of God? Quod nomē nemo nostrum in oratione auderet attingere, nisi ipse nobis sic permisisset orare. VVhiche Name (of Father) none of vs in our praiers woulde dare to vtter, sauinge that he hath geuen vs leaue so to praie. By these, the slenderes of M. Hardinges reason maie soone appeare: The prieste excuseth his owne vnVvorthines: Ergo, he offereth vp the Sonne of God. It is a Fallax, Ex meris particularibus, or, A non distributo ad distributum: and concludeth in Secunda Figura affirmatiue. An erreure knowen vnto Children.*

*Basil. Hen  
amer. 1.  
Ποῦ α-  
κὴ μελ-  
θους τῆς  
λεσόμε-  
νων ἀξίας;  
2. Cor. 2.  
Cyprian in  
Oration.  
Dominica*

*Harding.*

Among other shifts of M. Iewels Rhetorique, this is very common, where in deede he is most pressed with weight of good authoritie, or reason: there in woorde he sheweth forth greatest courage, and maketh resemblance, as al were nought, that is brought against him. But what say you good Sir? Hath not S. Dionysius in the place by me alleged no token at al, nor so much as an inkling of our offering vp of Christe vnto his Father? what creame is growen ouer your eyes, that you see not this truth in so cleare a light? what moueth you so to say? what proufe, what argument haue you?

*A Com-  
mō shifte  
of M.  
Iewels  
Rhetor-  
ique.*

Mary say you, *Dionysius clearely sheweth the difference, that is betwene the Sacrifice of the Crosse, and the*

*KK*

*Sacri-*



*Sacrifice of the holy Communion.* What conclude you? *Ergo*, he hath no token nor inkling of sacrificing Christ vnto his Father? O valiant Argument, O cunning Logician! May not this man be allowed to finde fault with other mennes Argumentes, that thus maketh an Argumēt him selfe, without either good forme, or true mater? For touching the forme, let it be graunted, that S. Dionysius had put such a difference, as you imagin, wil it necessarily folowe, that in the place alleged in my Answer, he maketh not mention of offering Christe vnto his Father? This kinde of reason in any mater is faulty, but in this mater it is most faulty. For albeit the manner of the oblatiō or Sacrifice made vpon the Crosse, be diuers from that which Christe made at his Supper, and is now continued by the Priestes in the Masse: yet the thing it selfe offred, and substance is al one in both Sacrifices, as it hath been clearly proued before by testimonie of S. Chrysostom, and others. So that the shewing of some difference betwene them, doth not exclude the thing or substance of either of them, nor concludeth them, so to be diuers, but the one may wel stande with the other.

In epistol.  
ad Hebr.  
Hom. 17.

Touching the mater of the former Argument, it is evidently false. For S. Dionysius in that place treateth not of difference betwene this, and that Sacrifice, as you M. Jewel would haue him appeare to doo by wilful falsifying of the place, by putting in woordes of your owne, and by clipping away wordes of that holy Doctor. These be S. Dionysius wordes, as they lye in the Greeke, faithfully englished. *Wherefore the Diuine Bishop standing at the Diuine Altar, doth praise the said holy and godly actions of IESVS, for his heavenly prouidence.*

Dionys. ec-  
cles. Hie-  
rare. Cap.  
3. p. 3.

nidence towards vs, whiche actions he ( according to the  
Scripture ) persfited for the saluation of Mankinde through  
the good pleasure of his most holy Father in the Holy Ghoste.  
And after that he hath ended the praises, and beholden  
the reuerent and spiritual contemplation of those things  
with the eyes of vnderstanding : he commeth vnto the  
Mystical Sacrifice of them, and that according to Gods  
tradition. By Gods tradition he meaneth that which  
Christe taught his Disciples at the Supper, how, and  
after what manner, they should offer this Sacrifice in re-  
membrance of his death.

κὴ τὸ το  
βιοπαρε  
δύτως

LUC. 22.

Now gentle Reader conferre this testimonie of  
S. Dionyse, and M. Iewels falsified allegation toge-  
ther. Note first, that the Bishop, or Priest, is said to  
stand at the holy Aulter. That clause M. Iewel hath  
quite cutte of. And by the way consider, to what pur-  
pose serueth an Aulther, onlesse there be a Real and  
outwarde Sacrifice to be made. Nexte, that there is no  
mention at al made of the flesh or Crosse of Christe,  
which termes he hath patched in of his owne. Thirdly  
the good pleasure of the Father, and holy Ghoste, is leaste out.  
To be shorte, whereas the praises be rendred not onely  
for Christes passion wrought in his flesh vpon the Crosse  
(albeit specially for that) but also for the doinges of his  
whole life, as for his birth, his fasting, his praying, his  
preaching, and the reste : he to make his fained differēce  
to appeare, hath drawn them vnto the thinges onely  
wrought by Christe vpon the Crosse. Such a licentious  
priuilege this man taketh vnto him selfe, to pare and hew  
lesse, and to enlarge at his owne pleasure, the saynges of  
the most auncient and learned Fathers.

Aulter.

M. Iewel  
falsifieth S  
Dionyse.

Againe, whereas the Greeke hath συμβολικὴν ἱερουργίαν, for which the Latine translation vseth this circumlocution, *sacra mysteria in signis celebranda*, the holy Mysteries that are to be celebrated in or vnder signes: he translateth it by the basest worde, that he coulde inuent of that signification, calling it, *Figuratiue sacrifice*, craftily intending to bring into the Readers mynde and conceit thereby, that this Sacrifice, wherein after praises in manner for al the actions of Christes life the body and bloude of Christe are offred vp: should appeare to be no better, then a bare figure, or then the figuratiue sacrifices of the olde lawe.

The premisses considered, what man but M. Jewel, would haue presumed to set abroad to the worlde in printe, a sentence of an olde writer so hewed and hackled, so bodged and peece, so corruptly translated? And who but he, could espie in that saying, any cleare and plaine difference between the Sacrifice of the Crosse, and the Sacrifice of the Aulter (which guilefully he calleth the Sacrifice of the holy Communion) such a one, as he impudently auoucheth to be?

But here S. Dionyse (saith he) calleth not the *Ministration of the holy Mysteries the sacrificing of Christe*. I graunt. How could he so cal it here, that is to say, in this your falsified sentence, which S. Dionyse neuer vttered? And sir, what if S. Dionyse do not so cal it? What maketh that to the point, that presently we treate of? Mine endeouour was not to shewe, that S. Dionyse calleth the *Ministration of the Mysteries the sacrificing of Christe*: but that in deede he sacrificed the body and bloude of Christe, and consequently Christe him selfe. And bicause it semed to him

to him very much, a mortal man to offer vp the body and bloude of his Lorde: reuerently, and in seemely wise, he maketh his excuse, saying, Lorde *thou hast said, Dooe thus in my remembrance.* As who should say, Lorde hadst thou not by thine expresse worde commaunded vs so to doo, I would not be so bolde, as to take that vpon me, which so farre passeth my worthinesse.

Hunt not after wordes, and syllables M. Iewel. When ye haue the thing it selfe, whereof ye contend, what a vaine wrangling is it, to require certaine precise termes? So when sometimes we bring you forth your owne very wordes, then you make a bragging about the meaning. These be the poore shifts of such, as being ouercome, that by the confession of their silence they might not seme ouercome, wil not holde their peace. This is that S. Augustine reproued in Pascenti<sup>us</sup> the Arian, whereof you were tolde before. *What is a more contentious parre* *August. epist. 174.* *(saith he) then to strue about the name (of Homusion* he meaneth) *where the thing it selfe is certainly known?*

What can you demaunde more? Haue you not here a manifest witnesse of sacrificing the healthful Sacrifice, which S. Dionyse acknowledgeth to be aboue his degree and worthinesse? What other is that, then the body and bloude of Christe? What is to be accompted healthful in comparison of that, which is, as S. Augustine calleth it, the Sacrifice of our Raunsom? That is to say, of that thing, whereby we haue ben bought from the Deuil, from hel, and euerlasting damnation. *August. Confess. lib. 9.*

If you say, this saying is to be expounded of the sacrifice of praise, and thankes geuing, tel vs, who euer gaue



the title of so foueraigne honour vnto such kinde of Sacrifice? Though it be our duetie, and also healthful for vs, to offer vp the sacrifice of praise, and thanks: yet who euer called it *hostiam salutarem*, the healthful hoste? The sacrifice of praise here I meane, as it is our owne spiritual worke, for otherwise I confesse, the blessed Sacrifice it selfe of the body and bloude of Christe, is also not seldom named the sacrifice of praise, as your selfe haue in this Diuision alleged a place out of S. Basils Masse, where it is so called.

And that S. Dionyse meant not the Sacrifice of praise and thanks, it is cleare, in that he speaketh of a Sacrifice to be offered, after that praises of Gods woorkes, and thanks for the same be geuen.

How be it, what so euer M. Iewel say there can be no doubt, what Sacrifice S. Dionyse meant. For by alleging this Scripture, *Dooe this in my remembrance*, for his warrant, he leadeth vs directly vnto the Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe, which he offered vp at his last Supper, as it is before proued by S. Ireneus, S. Cyprian, S. Chrysostome, Hesychius, Gregorie Nyssen, and others. Which Sacrifice because Christe him selfe both offered, and taught his Apostles likewise to offer in remembrance of him (for then he taught them the new Testament, saith S. Ireneus) and deliuered them a forme, how they should doo it afterwarde: in consideration hereof S. Dionyse, who beleeued Christe to be God, in this very place calleth it the Tradition of God.

Diuisio. 6.

Iren. li. 4.  
cap. 32.

The Tradition of  
God.

Again for further proufe of this most honorable  
and



and heauenly Sacrifice, this is to be considered in S. Dionyses Treatise. So long as the bishop, or Priest is attent to geuing praises, and thankes, for the great workes of God (which is also a kinde of sacrifice) so long we see none excuse made of any vnworthinesse. But the praises being once finished, as sone as he commeth vnto the mystical Sacrifice, before he dare to aduenture it, he premitteth his humble sute for excuse to be obtained.

What should the cause be, why the Bishop or Priest before the offering of the one Sacrifice maketh no excuse of his vnworthinesse, and here as he entreth vnto it maketh so humble an excuse: but bicause there is a great difference between the excellencie of the one, and the other? In both sacrifices Christes benefites be remembred, for how can that be praised, that is not remembred? The difference must nedes be in the excellencie of the thing offred. But what thing can be better and excellenter, then the praise of God, and rhankegeuing, but onely the body and bloud of Christ? Wherefore it must needes be the body and bloude of Christe, which the Bishop or Priest offered, premitting so humble an excuse, and appealing vnto Christes owne commaundement for his warrant.

This much with the circumstances of the place duely considered, I doubt not but any reasonable man wil sone conceiue S. Dionyse to speake of the Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe, and so consequently of Christe offered and sacrificed vnto God, to whom onely Sacrifice is to be made: though M. Iewel be so shamelesse as to say, that he hath no token, nor inkling of any such Sacrifice, and though in very deede

That S.  
Dionyse  
meaneth  
the Sacrifice  
of the  
body and  
bloude of  
Christe.

the

the precise termes of Sacrificing Christe, or the Sonne of God vnto his Father, be nor expressly set forth. The which termes, as to expresse them, it was not necessary, so of great discretion and wisdom, this holy learned Father, who liued in the Apostles time, eschewed: and yet he so signified the thing, by other wordes, as of the faithful it might be vnderstanded, and from the Infidels kept secret. Who if our Mysteries had bene with plaine speache made open vnto them, through lacke of faith, would haue had them in derision, and trodden them vnder their feete, as swyne doo precious stones, and as Heretiques doo at this day.

August. in  
Psalm. 33.  
& epistol.  
110.

Origen. in  
Leuit. ca.  
16. hom. 9

At the  
beginning  
of the  
Fa-  
thers  
spake se-  
cretly of  
the Sacri-  
fice. at leg-  
th vwhen  
the faith  
had pre-  
uailed ge-  
nerally,  
they spake  
more  
plainely.  
Cassiodor.  
Psalm. 109.

For which cause S. Augustine, and S. Chrysostome, and al other in manner the olde learned Fathers, speaking of this most reuerent Sacrifice, doo vse these or the like admonitions. *The Sacrifice, which the faithful knowe, and those that haue read the Gospel.* Againe. *The which Sacrifice, where, and when, and how it is offered, thou shalt knowe, when thou art baptized. &c.*

But in the age that folowed, when the faith was generally receiued ouer the worlde, the learned Fathers spake more plainely of it. As for example, *Cassiodorus* that noble Senatour of Rome, and learned writer, who liued about the yere of our Lorde. 570. in his Commentaries vpon the Psalmes, expounding the place of Christes euerlasting Priestthoode in the. 109. Psalme, saith thus in most plaine wise. *To whom can this truly, and evidently be applied, but vnto our Lorde our Saniour, who healthfully in the giste of bread and wine consecrated his Body and Bloude? As him selfe saith in the Gospel. Except ye eate the flesh of the Sonne of man, and drinke his*

this bloude, ye shal not haue life euermlasting. But in this flesh  
and bloude, let mans mynde conceiue, nothing that is bloudy,  
nothing that is corruptible, least it come to passe which the  
Apostle saith, he that eateth the body of our Lorde vnwor- 1. Cor. 11.  
shily, eateth to him selfe condemnation: (the wordes that  
folowe be these). *Sed viuificatricem substantiam, atque sa-  
lutarem, & ipsius verbi propriam factam: per quam pecca-  
torum remissio, & vite eterne dona praeantur.* But let  
(the mynde of man conceiue it to be) the quickening,  
and healthful substance, and that which was made the  
worde it selfe owne proper substance, by which the remis-  
sion of sinnes, and the giftes of euermlasting life be genen.  
The which order (of Priesthode and Sacrifice) by mytical  
similitude Melchisedech that most iust king did institute, Gen. 14.  
when he offered vp vnto our Lorde the fruites of bread and  
wine. For it is cleare, that the sacrifices of beastes are  
quite gone away, which were of the order of Aaron, and  
that Melchisedeks order rather remaineth, which in the  
deliuering forth of the Sacramentes is celebrated in al the  
worlde. Which thing the obstinate Iewes doo not yet vn-  
derstand, whereas it is certaine, that both their Priest,  
and Sacrifices are taken quite away.

This learned Father here setteth forth plainly  
three thinges concerning the Sacrifice we speake of.  
The first is, that Christe at his Supper consecrated his  
body and bloude, which you M. Iewel in your Replie Pag. 19.  
of the first Article doo denie. The second is, what  
flesh, and what bloude it is, that is so consecrated, to  
wit, vnbloudy bloude, and, if it be lawfull so to speake,  
vnfleshy flesh, and yet true flesh, and true bloude, euen  
the quickening substance, that, which is proper to the

Worde, it selfe, and whereby Mankinde is redemed. The thirde is, that the Priestthoode after Melchisedeks order remaineth stil, doubtelesse bicause as Christe presenteth him selfe continually in heauen vnto the Father for vs: so by Priestes of the newe Testament, his Vicars, he offereth him selfe vnto the Father now also in earth vnder the formes of bread and wine, after the order of Melchisedek. Which Sacrifice is now frequented ouer al the world, the Iewes sacrifices being vtterly abandoned.

A cleare  
testimo-  
ny agaiſt  
those,  
that  
make this  
only a fi-  
guratiue  
Sacrifice.

Isidorus that holy and learned Bishop of Hispa-  
lis now called Siniile in Spaine, hauing declared out  
of the Scripture, that in the time of Sacrifices in the  
olde Lawe, the Leuites sowned their trumpets, by  
way of comparison speaking of the Offertories soong  
in the Church, saith, that *now we likewise doo sing,*  
*with deede and harte vntering forth praises to our Lorde*  
*in the time of our Sacrifice.* *In illo vero Sacrificio, cuius*  
*sanguine saluatus est mundus,* be his wordes, that isto  
de Eccles. say, In that true Sacrifice, by the bloude whereof  
Officijs. the worlde is saued. Here he calleth it the true  
li. 1. ca. 14 Sacrifice, whereby M. Iewels wicked assertion of his  
only figuratiue Sacrifice, is quite dashed, and ouer-  
throwen.

Ibidem.  
cap. 18.

Againe in an other place, *The Sacrifice* (saith he)  
*which is offered vp vnto God by the Christians, Christe*  
*our Lorde and Maister did first institute it, when he*  
*gaue vnto the Apostles his body and his bloude, before*  
*he was betrayed: as it is read in the Gospel, Iesus (saith*  
*the Euangelist) tooke bread, and the Cuppe, and hauing*  
Mat. 26. *blessed, gaue to them. The which Sacrament Melchi-*  
*sedeck King of Salem first offered vp figuratiuely in type*

(or



(or token) of the body and bloude of Christe: and the same man first of it expressed imaginarily (or in image) the Myserie of this so great a Sacrifice, foreshewing the likenesse of our Lorde and Saviour Iesus Christe the euerlasting Priest. To whom it is said, Thou arte a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedech. Imagina-  
Psal. 109. This Sacrifice the Christians haue bene commaunded to celebrate, the Iewish sacrifices leaste of and ended, which were commaunded to be celebrated, when the people of the olde Lawe were vnder seruitude. And so then this thing is done of vs, which our Lorde him selfe did for vs, whiche he offered not in the morning, but afterward, for he did it in the euening.

By this it is cleare, that Christe offered vp his body and bloude, before he was betrayd, that is to say, at his last Supper, when he gaue the same to his Apostles, that he instituted, and commaunded the same Sacrifice to be celebrated of vs: That this is the true Sacrifice, whereof Melchisedech in his sacrifice expressed the Image, figure, and type. Whereby M. Iewels onely imaginatiue, figuratiue, and typical Imagination, to exclude the real presence and substance of Christes Flesh and Bloude, is vtterly condemned.

For the truth of the Real presence, and of this Sacrifice he speaketh afterwarde in the same place more plainely, if any thing may more plainely be spoken. Exhorting married persons to abstaine certaine daies from their carnal imbracings, and to geue them selues to prayer, before they come to receiue the body of Christe, thus he saith

LL ij Let



Ibidem.

Let vs peruse the booke of the Kinges, and we shal finde, that Abimelech the Priest would not geue to Dauid, and his men any of the Shewbreads, before he asked them whether they were pure from women, not from strange women, but from their owne wiues. And except he had heard, that they had abstained from the wedlocke worcke from the time of yesterday and the day before: he would neuer haue graunted them the breades, which before he had denyed to them. Now so great difference there is between the Shewbreades, and the body of Christe, how much difference there is between the body, and the shadow, between the Image, and the truth, between the samplers of thinges to come, and the thinges them selues, which were figured by the samplers. Thus Isidorus.

If the thing we haue in the Sacrament of the Altar, were but a signe, figure, or token of Christes body, then would not this holy and learned Father, as sundry other Fathers haue done, so earnestly haue exhorted married persons to forebeare their wedlocke-worke before the receiuing of it: yea specially then would not he by comparing this with the Shewbread, so much haue preferred this before that. For that was also a figure of the body of Christe. And if that whiche we haue be no more but a figure, then was that as good as this. Now Isidorus preferreth this before that, as being the body it selfe, whereof that was the shadow, the truth, whereof that was the Image, the thing it selfe, whereof that was a sampler. Wherefore to conclude, this being the true and real Body of Christe, whereas Priestes offer vp and sacrifice the same, as we must graunt they doo, or denie the Fathers: it folo-

it foloweth, that they offer vp and sacrifice Christe the Sonne of God vnto his Father. The like, and plainer sayings for the truth of this Sacrifice, if neede were, might in great number sone be recited out of the other Fathers, that wrote sithens the faith of Christ was generally receiued where it was preached, and al superstition of Gentilitie quite abolished, but these may suffice.

Now whereas S. Dionyse calleth this our Sacrifice of the Aulter, *συμβολικὴν ἱερωγίαν* a sacrifice symbolical, or done in signes, or figure: we also graunt it to be symbolical, for vnder the signes that are visible and familiar to our senses, the heauenly Mysteries, to wit, the body and bloude of Christe, the substance of our Sacrifice, are inuisibly contained. And we say, that S. Dionyse is here to be vnderstanded to speake of a signe or figure, as proper to the newe, and not to the olde Lawe, euen so as S. Gregorie Nazianzen meaneth by a figure, when he saith, *Iam Pascha sumus participes, figuraliter tamen adhuc, & si Pascha hoc veteri sit manifestius. Si quidem Pascha legale, audenter dico, figura figura erat obscurior.* Let vs now be partakers of the Passeouer, but yet figuratiuely as yet, albeit this Passeouer be more manifest, then the Olde was. For the Passeouer of the Lawe was (I am bolde thus to say) a darcke figure of a figure. Here is our Passeouer, that is to say, our Sacrament, called a figure, but yet much more manifest, then the olde figures were, for they were but figures of figures.

In vvhatsense is the Sacrifice symbolical, or figuratiue.

Gregor. Nazian. Hom. 4. de Pasch.

And why is our most blessed Sacrament a figure? S. Gregorie euen there sheweth it to be so called in

L.L. iij respect

respekte of the fruition of the same, whiche we shal enioye in Heauen, where we shal after an heauenly manner, eate, and drinke it, without any Figure, or coouer. Such a Figure or signe doth not onely signifie, but containeth also the thing signified. In consideration whereof S. Augustine putting a difference betwene the Sacramentes of the Newe and of the olde Testament, saith, that *The Sacramentes of the Newe Testament geue Saluation, and the Sacramentes of the Olde Testament promised the Saviour*. Suche signes as geue saluation, be meete Sacramentes of the Newe Testament, of such kinde of signe or figure speaketh S. Dionyse, where he vseth the terme Symbolical, speaking of the Sacrifice of the Body and Bloude of Christe.

*August. in  
Psal. 73.*

*Answere  
to Pachy-  
meres.*

As for that M. Iewel allegeth out of Prchymes the Paraphrase, who saith, *The Priest commeth to the Bread, and the Cuppe*, whereof he would faine conclude, that the inuisible substance of the Sacrifice is not the body and bloude of Christe: it standeth him in litle stede. For in deede it is bread and wine, when the Priest first commeth vnto them to celebrate the Sacrifice: But when the wordes of Christe be comme vnto them (as S. Ambrose saith) that is to say, when the Priest hath duely pronounced the wordes of Consecration: then are they made the body and bloude of Christe, and so the Sacrifice of Christe.

*Ambros. de  
Sacramēt.  
lib. 4 cap 5*

And that Pachymeres was of this beleefe, it is cleare by his owne wordes, whiche M. Iewel either knewe not, and so speaketh ignorantly, or knewe wel yenough, yet dissembled, and so doth maliciously.

Bicause

Bicause for some credite of his purpose he cited his woordes in Greke (though by casting in one woorde of his owne which he founde not in the texte, after his common woonte he hath somedeale falsified the sentence) I wil also here truely cite the woordes in Greke, by which Pachymeres sheweth him selfe to be Catholique in this point, and quite contrary to M. Iewels Sacramentarie doctrine. They be these.

Πολλοὶ μὲν ὥς μόνα τὰ θεία παρὰ κύψουσι σύμβολα, ἅτε μὴ *Pachymee.*  
 δυνάμενοι ὑψηλότερόν τι γνῶσθαι, αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ ἱεράρχης, πρὸς *in Dionys.*  
 ἐκείνα τὰ πρῶτότυπα, αὐτὸ τοῦ κυρίου τίμιον σῶμα καὶ αἷμα *Eccles. Hie*  
 ἀνάγεται, πιστεύων ὅτι καὶ τὰ προκείμενα, ὥς ἐκείνα μετεβλή- *rarch. Ep.*  
 θησαν ὡς ἅγια καὶ παντοῦ ὡς πνεύμασι. *3. pag. 136.*  
 As muche to  
 say in English. There be many that cast their eye  
 vpon the holy signes onely, as they who are not ha-  
 ble to conceiue any higher thing. But the Bisshop  
 him selfe is caried vp vnto those first samplers (or natural  
 thinges) to wit, the pretious body, and bloude it selfe  
 of our Lorde, beleuing that the thinges which are set  
 forth (that is to say, the bread and wine) be changed  
 into them by the holy and almighty Ghoste.

Lo M. Iewel, here haue you the cleare testimonie  
 of Pachymeres him selfe, for his true and Catholique  
 beleefe touching the truth of Christes body and bloud  
 in the Sacrament. Which beleefe is, not onely that  
 the pretious body and bloude of our Lorde are of a right  
 beleeuer beholden, and conceiued in the Sacrament  
 verely present, which the Lutherans do acknowledge:  
 but also that the bread and wine are by the power of  
 the holy Ghoste, into the same conuerted and chan-  
 ged

Transub-  
 stantiation

ged, whiche neither ye, nor Luthers ſcholers doo beleeue: and ſo by Pachymeres tranſubſtantion is auouched.

After al this M. Iewel diſpoſeth him ſelfe to dally at an Argument of his owne mery heads forging, bearing the Reader in hand, it is myne. And this Argument forſooth is ſuch, and ſo vnſkilful, as a yong Sophiſter (ſaith he) would neuer haue framed it. What any yong Sophiſter would doo, I knowe not. But now certaine it is, that be it wel, or otherwiſe, it is framed by as olde a Sophiſter, as your ſelfe are M. Iewel. If it be vnſkilfully framed, the blame is yours: for yours it is, not myne.

Here that you be ſo ful of your Argumentes (which vntruely you father vpon me) and ſo buſy with your Logique, I anſwer you, as S. Auguſtine answered Iulian the Pelagian Heretique dealing with him, as you doo with me, not onely in this place, but in manner in your whole booke. *Quantum tibi places, tantum graui- bus Lectoribus displices, & quod peius eſt, fingis me dicere quod non dico, concludere, ſicut non concludo, & cat.* Looke (ſaith he) how much you ſtande in your owne conceite, ſo muche you are out of conceite with the graue Readers, and, which is worſe, you ſeine me to ſay, that which I ſay not, to conclud, ſo as I conclude not.

If you would needes ſhewe your cunning in Logique, and diſpute after the rules of that arte, why reherſed you not the whole Antecedent? Though in this place I frame no Argume at al, but onely recite the ſaying of S. Dionyſe applying it to my purpoſe: yet if

M. Iewel  
forgeth  
Argmēt.

Auguſtin.  
contra Iu-  
lian. lib 3  
cap. 7.



yet if the whole should be disposed in forme of an Argument, this is the Argument, that thereof might be concluded, the circumstance of the place considered.

The Bishop, or Priest (by reporte of S. Dionysse) standing at the holy Aulter, after he hath geuen praises to God for his Diuine workes, commeth vnto the mystical Sacrifice, excusing him selfe for that he taketh vpon him to offer vp the healthful hoste or Sacrifice that is farre aboute his worthinesse, whereof Christe at his last Supper hauing consecrated his body and bloude, said, by way of commaundement and commission, *Doe ye this in my*

An Argument gathered out of S. Dionysse for the Sacrifice.

*Remembrance*: But this healthful Sacrifice whereof Christe so said, and which he required to be offered, is the Sacrifice of his body and bloude vnder the formes of bread and wine: *Ergo*, by witnesse of that Auncient and most worthy Father, the Bishop or Priest, offereth vp Christes body and bloude, and consequently Christ him selfe. For where the body of Christe is, there also is whole Christe; bicause of the inseparable vnitie of both naturés. And if Christe be thus offered, to whom is he offered, but to the Father? Albeit I confesse, that Christe is offered to him selfe also as being God, and to the holy Ghoste, to the whole most blessed Trinitie.

If you had thus set forth the Argument M. Iewel, and dealt simply and truly, you should not haue needed to trouble the reader with so much Sophistrie and Logique, as here for confutation of your owne forged reason you haue bestowed. Bicause you knewe your selfe not hable to auoide the force of the whole Antecedent, flyly you answer to that parte of it onely, where it is said,

MM

the

the Priest excuseth him selfe, as though I had layd the chiefe grounde of the authoritie in that clause onely. And thereof you take occasion to enter into a needlesse common place, proouing by certaine testimonies, which no man euer denied, that sundry holy thinges are to be done not presumptuously and rashly, but reuerently, and with feare and trembling, as namely when we offer vp the Sacrifice of Praise, when we baptise, when we preache, or heare Gods holy worde, when we pray, and cal God our Father. For the reuerent and humble demeanour that we ought to shewe in doing these holy thinges, you allege S. Basil, S. Dionyse, S. Paule, S. Cyprian.

But what of all this? wilt thereof folowe, *Ergo*, though the Priest standing at the Aulter, and comming to offer the Mystical Sacrifice, excuse him selfe (not for praying, preaching, praising, or baptizing, but) for offering the healthful hoste, that farre passeth his degree, euen the same, that Christe offered at his laste Supper, whereof he said, This is my Body, this is my Bloud; and gaue commission to doo the same: yet he offereth not Christe vnto his Father? This is the iust iudgement of God M. Iewel, that you where you be so busy in scorning at other mens good Argumentes, be founde your selfe to frame most sonde and childishe Argumentes, by certaine phraes eluding weighty pointes of Christian Religion, and alwaies impugning one trueth by an other trueth, which way of reasoning is of al other the weakest.

Thus you see good Sir, that I haue not prooued this Sacrifice only by the vnworthinesse of the Priest, as  
you

you say, but by other force clearly appearing in the fore-  
said testimonie of S. Dionyse.

Of al the authorities, that here to litle purpose  
you haue alleged, I had thought to touche neuer a one,  
forasmuche as I yeelde to that by the same is reported:  
had you not too shamefully falsified and corrupted a  
sentence of S. Gregorie Nazianzen, bothe with your  
false interlaced glose, and by changing the whole pur-  
porte thereof. Thus you make that learned Father to  
speake: *How can they, or dare they offer vnto God (he saith  
not the body of Christe really, and in deede, but) the figure of  
these great Mysteries?*

M. Ievvel  
falsifieth  
and fow-  
ly cor-  
rupted S.  
Gregorie  
Naziane-  
zene.

Nowe let vs see S. Gregorie Nazianzens owne  
woordes. The whole sentence being long, I wil re-  
cite onely the later ende of it, which aunswereth to  
your allegation. Πῶς ἔμελλον διαφθεῖναι προσηύειν αὐτῷ  
τὴν ἑξοδὲν (θεοῦ) τὴν τῶν μυστικῶν μυστηρίων ἀγίτυπον?  
As much to say. Howe shoulde I dare to offer vp vnto  
him ( he meaneth God) the external Sacrifice, that is the  
sampler of the great Mysteries?

Gregor.  
Nazian.  
in Apolo-  
getico.  
S. Grego-  
rie Nazia-  
nzen ac-  
know-  
ledgeth  
the exte-  
nal Sacri-  
fice.

Compare this, and your owne allegation together,  
and you shal perceiue your vntrue dealinge and cor-  
ruption of the sentence to be espied. You haue chan-  
ged the firste person singuler, into the thirde person  
plural. Whiche is an argument, that your selfe neuer  
saw the place it selfe in the Author, but receiued it  
of some, that was appointed to gather notes for you,  
such, as you might frame to your purpose. Your Note-  
gatherer espying as he thought some vantage in the la-  
ter woordes of the Sentence, wrote them out onely,  
leauing out the beginning, where the pronounne *you*

is expreffely founde. And fo both you and he were de-  
ceiued in the verbe, *ἐμὸν*, which ferueth indifferently  
to the firft perfon finguler, or to the third perfon plural,  
you of ignorance, as I fuppofe, he of malice, fpecially if  
he were learned.

Although this be no litle faulte, yet is it not the grea-  
teft by many partes. For you haue quite hewed away a  
principal member of the fentence, to wit, *τὴν ἑξωθεν*,  
that is to fay, the external Sacrifice, for *θυσίαν*, that is, Sa-  
crifice, is there to be fupplied. Whereby you shewe vn-  
to vs, that, as you and your companions haue bannifhed  
the thing it felfe already out of the Churches of Englād,  
fo would you gladly alfo fkrape the name and terme out  
of the bookes of the auncient writers, if by any meanes  
ye could. For this one claufe, *the external Sacrifice*, ouer-  
throweth al your doctrine againft the Sacrifice of the  
Aulter, and proueth your interlined Glofe to be falfe,  
and heretical. For if it be an external Sacrifice, it can not  
be but real, and true, and a Sacrifice in dede.

The addition that foloweth in S. Gregorie, *τὴν τῶν  
μεγάλων μυστηρίων ἀντίτυπον*, is nothing els, but a declara-  
tion of what external Sacrifice he fpake, to wit, not of  
that great external and open Sacrifice, which Chrifte  
offered vpon the Croffe, but of the true fampler of the  
fame. Which is the external Sacrifice of the Church,  
made by the minifterie of the Priest vpon the Aulter, one  
with the other in fubftance, but diuers in the manner of  
offering, as we are driuen by your affectate and difsem-  
bled ignorance ofentimes to fay. Of this terme, *ἀντίτυ-  
πον*, fampler, how it is to be taken, I haue already, decla-  
red before in the . 4. Diuifion. Here to reherfe the fame  
again,

External  
Sacrifice.

Antitypō.  
Fol. 82. b.  
C. 23.



again, it were superfluous.

Now I require thee to iudge indifferently gentle Reader, whether M. Iewel be to be accompted a true and a faithful dealer in these weighty causes concerning our faith, and whether he be not worthy to be suspected, who hath so fowly falsified and corrupted this auncient and learned Father, by changing one person into another, one number into another, by altering the true sense with his heretical *parenthesis*, and by maiming the whole sentence with his cutting away of a principal member.

In the ende M. Iewel to leaue in the Readers mynde an opinion of his skil in Logique, which is known to be very smal, repeating againe the former Argument of his owne forging, and falsly ascribed vnto me, saith: *It is a fallax à meris particularibus*, a kind of fallacie of his owne inuention, vnknown to Aristotle, and to al that haue writte since of deceirful Argumentes. For al skilful Logicians do knowe, that of two premisses being both particular, a good argument may be concluded, although it be not directly in any of the three perfite Figures. And if the Argument be not faulty for this cause, yet it procedeth (saith he) *A non distributo ad distributū*. Wel, if it so procede and therefore be naught, let him selfe amende it, that made it. As for my ground, it resteth vpon the authoritie of S. Dionyse the blessed Apostle S. Pauls scholer.

A new fallacie di-  
uised by  
M. Iewel.

An other faulte in this Argument, is founde contrary to the rules of Logique, for that it concludeth (saith this great Logician) affirmatiuely in the second Figure. What Sir? Haue you forgotten your selfe so quickly? Said you not in the line before, it was *ex meris particularibus*? If it be so, then is it neither in the first, nor second, nor third

Beholde  
reader  
the rare  
cunning  
this man  
hath in  
Logique.



**Diuis. 2.**

**A Reioindre to M. Jewels Replie**

Figure. So that either the first faulte is none, and this later one: or this later none, and the first one, or rather neither this, nor that any at al. Beside this it is an *Enthymema*, consisting onely of two propositions. And then if it were myne Argument, how knowe you to what Mode and Figure, by a litle displacing of the termes, I were hable to reduce it vnto, if it should be denyed?

*Prouer. 26* Thus I abuse thy leifure gentle Reader with standing vppon these trifles. But I trust, thou wilt consider, how farre I was enforced thereunto by M. Jewels trifling in an earnest mater. And as by the aduise of the wise man, we may aunswere a foole according to his foolishnes, least he seme wise in his owne conceit: so sometimes it is profitable, to answer a trifler, according to his trifles, that he may beholde his owne vanitie and trifling witte. And thus standerh S. Dionyses saying in his ful force.

**The. 9. Diuision.**

**The Answer.**

*Lib. 4.  
cap. 23.*

**I**Renæus receiued the same from S. Iohn the Euangelist, by Polycarpus S. Iohns scholar. He declareth it with these wordes: Eum, qui ex creatura Panis est, accepit, & gratias egit, dicens, Hoc est Corpus meum, Et Calicem similiter, qui est ex creatura quæ est secundum nos, suum Sanguinem confessus est, & Noui Testamenti no-

ti nouam docuit Oblationem, quam Ecclesia  
 ab Apostolis accipiens, in vniuerso mundo  
 offert Deo. De quo in duodecim Prophe-  
 tis Malachias sic presignificauit, Non est mi- *Malac. 1.*  
 hi voluntas in vobis, dicit D O M I N V S ex-  
 ercituum: & munus non suscipiam de manu  
 vestra. He tooke that, which by creation is breade,  
 and gaue thanks, sayinge, This is my Body. And  
 likewise the Cuppe ful of that Creature, whiche is  
 here with vs, and confessed it to be his Bloade, and  
 thus taught the newe Oblation of the Newe Testa-  
 mente, whiche the Church receiuinge of the Apost-  
 les, dooth offer to God through the whole worlde,  
 whereof Malachie one of the twelue Prophetes did  
 prophecie thus: I haue no likinge in you, saith our Lord  
 almightie, neither wil I take Sacrifice of your handes:  
 bicause from the risinge of the Sunne, to the going  
 downe of the same, my name is glorified amonge  
 the Nations, and Incense is offered to my name in e-  
 uery place, and pure Sacrifice, for that my name is  
 greate amonge Nations. What can be vnderstan-  
 ded by this newe Oblation of the Newe Testa-  
 mente other, then the Oblation of that, which he  
 saide to be his Body, and confessed to be his Bloude?  
 And if he had offered Breade and Wine onely, or the  
 Figure of his Body, and Bloude in Bread and Wine,  
 it had

it had beene no Newe Oblation, for suche had beene made by Melchisedech longe before. Neither can the Prophecie of Malachie be vnderstanded of the Oblation of Christe vppon the Crosse, forasmuche as that was doone but at one time onely, and in one certaine place of the worlde, in Golgotha, a place without the gates of Hierusalem, neare to the walles of that Citie. Concerninge the Sacrifice of a contrite, and an humbled harte, and al other Sacrifices of our deuotion, that be mere Spiritual, they can not be called the Newe Oblation of the newe Testament, forasmuche as they were doone as wel in the Olde Testamente, as in the Newe, neither be they altogether pure. Wherefore this place of Ireneus, and also the Prophecie of Malachie, wherewith it is confirmed, must needes be referred to the Sacrifice and Oblation of the Bodie and Bloude of Christe daily throughout the whole worlde offered to God in the Masse, which is the external Sacrifice of the Church, and proper to the Newe Testament: which, as Ireneus saith, the Church receiued of the Apostles, and the Apostles of Christe.

Iewel.

Here at laste, M. Harding hath founde out the name of a Sacrifice, that was not denied him. But the Sacrifice, that he hath so long sought for, and hath so assuredly promised to finde, hitherto he hath not founde. For Ireneus not once nameth, neither the Masse, nor this Real Oblation of the

of the Sonne of God vnto his Father. Thus onely he saith, God hath vtterly misliked, and refused the olde Carnal Sacrifices of the Iewes: and hath taught vs to offer vp the New Sacrifice of the new Testamente, according to the Prophecie of Malachie. This Sacrifice, M. Harding imagineth, can be none other, but the offering vp of Christ in the Masse. These Conclusions be very suddaine. The Olde learned Fathers could neuer vnderstande so much. One of M. Hardings ouer Nerve founde Doctours, Martialis, saith thus, Oblatio munda, non tantum in Ara Sanctificata offertur, sed etiam vbique: The pure Sacrifice, which Malachie meaneth, is offered, not only vpon the Holy Aultare (or Communion Table) but also euery where. M. Harding saith, It is offered onely vpon the Aultare: Certainly if Malachie meante the Sacrifice, that may be offered in places, and without an Aultare, as Martialis saith, then he meante the Sacrifice of the Masse. Tertullian saith, That the Prophete Malachie by that pure Sacrifice, meant the Preaching of the Gospel: the offering vp of a Contrite Harte: and praier proceeding from a pure Conscience. S. Hierom likewise expoundeth the same of the Sacrifice of Praier, and openeth it by these VVordes of the Prophete Dauid: Let my Praier be directed, as incense before thy sight. S. Augustine calleth the same, Sacrificium Laudis, & Gratiarum actionis: The Sacrifice of Praise, and of Thankesgeuinge.

Harding.

What truth thou arte like to find in M. Iewels Reply to the rest of this Diuision, thou maist sone conceiue Reader, seing he maketh his entrie with so shamelesse, and so open a lye. Here at the last (saith he) M. Harding hath found the name of Sacrifice. And but here at the laste good Sir? As though expresse mention of Sacrifice were not contained in sundry testimonies before alleged. Where be your eyes? Nay where is your fidelitie? Where is your sinceritie? Where is your honestie? Where is your shame-

NN

fastnesse

Malac. 1.  
Martialis  
ad Burd-  
galenses.  
Tertul.  
contra  
Iudaos.  
Tertul.  
contra  
Marcio.  
lib. 4.  
Martialis Hieron. in  
1. cap. Ma  
Hieron. in  
Zacha. li.  
2. cap. 8.  
Aug. con-  
tra aduer.  
Legis, &  
Prophet.  
cap. 20.  
Contra  
Liter. Pe-  
tilian. lib.  
2. cap. 86.



ΤΗΣ ὁδοῦ  
κὺν τοῦ ἱε-  
ρουσίου.  
Hesych. li.  
1. cap. 4.  
Diony. Ec-  
clesiast.  
Hierarch.  
6. l. p. 3.

fastnesse? Doth not S. Dionyse in the last Diuision be-  
fore this name the Sacrifice, \* that is about his worthy-  
nesse? Doth not Hesychius say, that *Christe at his Supper*  
*sacrificed him selfe*? Doth not Eusebius reporte vnto you  
the dreadful Sacrifices of Christes Table? I leaue the  
reste. For shame M. Iewel if you haue no way to escape  
the iust request of your promised Subscription but by  
lying, yet haue some regarde of your estimation, that  
the very simplest of the worlde espye not out your so  
grosse lying.

And now touching the chiefe point of this Diuision,  
what, thinke you to auoide the strength of S. Irenæus  
testimonie for the Sacrifice, bicause he nameth not *the*  
*Masse* expressely, nor *the real Oblation of the Sonne of*  
*God vnto his Father*? Why Sir then wil you not stād to the  
mater, but cowardly flie away and lurke in termes? How  
be it, *the real Oblation of the Sonne of God vnto his Father*  
(if you wil needes put the trust of your cause in termes)  
if you remember, be not the wordes of your owne Cha-  
lenge.

If this Argument be good, that here you make, S. Ire-  
næus not once nameth the Masse, nor real Oblation of  
the Sonne of God vnto his Father, *Ergo*, by him the Sa-  
crifice of the Church can not be auouched: why may  
not this also be as good! Not one of the foure Euange-  
listes saith expressely, that Christe offered or sacrificed  
him selfe vpon the Crosse, nor once nameth that Sacri-  
fice of Christe: *Ergo* Christe was not sacrificed for vs  
vpon the Crosse? If this Argument shalbe taken for  
good, then haue the Arians ouercomme. For if the  
Church shalbe driuen to shewe letters, syllables, and  
termes,



termes: neither can we finde the Cōsubstantialitie of the Sonne of God with the Father, nor the Proceſſion of the holy Ghoſte from the Father and the Sonne, nor certaine other great pointes of our Faith, which notwithstanding being reueled to the Church by the holy Ghoſte the ſpirite of truth, and declared by the expositions of the holy Fathers, we are bounde to beleue vnder paine of eternal damnation.

Knowing your ſelfe ouerborne with the force of this plaine teſtimonie of S. Irenæus, craftily you diſſemble it, and keepe your ſelfe a looſe of from reherſing the wordes, pretending thereby that he neuer ſaid ſo, as I haue reported him. But let the booke be vewed, and it ſhal be founde, wil you nil you, that I haue truly alleged him. You on the other ſide, to conueigh the whole point to Malachie the Prophete, where you thought rather to haue ſome colour of aduantage: come in with a forged ſaying of your owne, and ſetting it forth in the lettre, that you cauſed the Doctours ſayings to be printed in, you aſcribe it vnto S. Irenæus, whereas the ſentence which here you haue inſerted (pretending for credit your ſolemne warrant with theſe wordes, *Thus onely he ſaith*) is not in S. Irenæus.

M. Ieuvel  
forgeth  
ſayings  
of his  
ovvne  
head, and  
reporteth  
them for  
the ſayin-  
ges of S.  
Ireneus.

You ſhould haue tolde vs, and with good authoritie haue prooued it, what other thing can be vnderſtanded by the *newe Oblation of the newe Teſtament*, whereof S. Irenæus ſpeaketh, but the Oblation of that, which Chriſt ſaid to be his body, and confeſſed to be his bloude. To this you make no direſte Answer, but ſlily carye away the reader vnto the ſaying of Malachie, whereof I haue treated before. I vrge you with S. Irenæus, and you

M. Ieuvel  
diuerteth  
from the  
teſtimo-  
nie wher  
vvith he  
is vrged,  
and en-  
treth into  
an other  
mater,

shooting wide of the marke make answer to the place of Malachie, whose saying is not in this place principally obiected, but brought in by the way as it were, by Saint Irenæus, interpretinge the pure Sacrifice by him mentioned, of the Newe Oblation of the Newe Testament.

*The olde learned Fathers (you say) neuer vnderstoode so much. So much? What so muche meane you? That the Oblation of Christes body and Bloud, is, the new Oblation*  
*Irenæus li. 4. cap. 23. of the New Testament, which Christ taught his Disciples, which the Church receiued of the Apostles, and now offereth vp vnto God through the whole wrilde, as S. Irenæus saith? Did the Fathers neuer vnderstand this much? What say you then to S. Irenæus, who vnderstoode so much, as by his wordes it is cleare? What is this, but to set the holy Fathers at variance with S. Irenæus?*

Yet you wil needes seme to vnderstande the Sacrifice that Malachie spake of, of Preaching, of a Contrite hart, of Prayer, of Praise, and thankesgeuing. For credite hereof you allege Tertullia, S. Hierom, and S. Augustini. Wel, what if it be so? What answer is that to S. Irenæus? As for the place of Malachie, as I said before, it is past, and answered. Certainly it can not be vnderstanded of the purenes of mans hart, for of lacke therof he complaineth not, but of polluted sacrifices. Againe the purenes of mans harte, commonly is not so great, as therefore, the name of God, should so much be magnified. And the same was in many Iewes then, no lesse then it is in the Christiāns now.

To that you bringe out of Tertullian, and S. Hierome, concerning what is meante by the Pure Sacrifice in Malachie, you haue myne answer before in the

the thirde Diuision . What you bringe here , you brought the same before . Sparing my labour , inke , and paper , I remitte the Reader vnto that place , where he shal finde you to haue but a weake aide of Tertullian , and shamefully to haue falsified S. Hierome , as becometh such false shifters to doo.

In the 3.  
Diuision  
fol. 90. b.  
& de in-  
ceps.

To prooue that Malachie by the pure Sacrifice meant not the Sacrifice of the Aulter, you bringe in S. Martialis *ad Burdegalenses*, whom you cal one of myne owne newe founde Doctours. If you contemne him, why doo you allege him? Wil you shunne his auctoritie, and yet craue helpe of him? If I would vse your owne Rhetorique, here might I say, what toole is so bad, that Maister Iewel wil not occupie, rather then seeme to be without al weapon? Of what authoritie so euer he be, once this is true, in your translation you haue sowly falsified him, by putting in woordes of your owne forgerie. For he speaketh nothing at al of Malachie, nor in that place once nameth him. Whose name you added of your owne vnto the sentence out of him alleged, to vnderproppe your weake and ruinous building with al.

M. Ieuvel  
falsifieth  
Martialis.

In that Epistle *ad Burdegalenses*, S. Martialis vnderstandeth by *Ara Sanctificata*, one Special Aulter, that in the Citie of Burdeaulx was consecrated in the name of GOD, and S. Steuen. Which Aulter being in olde time dedicated to an vnknownen God, he at the ouerthrowe of Idols Aulter there caused to be reserved whole, and him selfe halowed it. This much is declared in the Epistle it selfe. And as you haue falsified your Doctor with putting in stufte of your owne to the

Martialis  
Epistol. ad  
Burdegal.

beginning of the sentence, so haue you corrupted him much worse, with cutting away from the middest the hinder parte. For these be his wordes, *Nec solum in ara sanctificata, sed ubique offertur Deo oblatio munda, sicut testatus est, cuius corpus & sanguinem in vitam eternam offerimus.* Neither onely vpon the halowed Aulter, but euery where is the cleane oblation offered vp vnto God, as he hath witnessed, whose body and bloude we offer vp to life euerlasting. And what is that Christ hath witnessed? for of him he speaketh. That Priestes should offer vp his body and bloude in euery countrie, saying, *Do this in my Remembrance.* This serued not your purpose, and therefore you hewed it away.

Luc.22.

Double  
oblation,  
one in  
spirite on  
ly, the o-  
ther in  
the Sacra-  
ment.

If this answer do not satisfie you, may it please you to take this other. S. Martialis speaketh of two kindes of Oblations. The one is offered vp in spirite only. the other in mysterie and in the Sacrament. The spiritual oblation is offered vp not only vpon a sanctified Aulter, but also euery where. But the mystical and Sacramental oblation which is of the body and bloud of Christe, is offered vp only vpon a consecrated Aulter, bicause thereon is the real presence of the same. And of that kinde of oblation in that very place which you haue so fowly corrupted, he saith thus. *Christ hauing a body both unspotted, and without synne, bicause he was conceived of the Holy Ghoste, and borne of the virgin Marie, permitted it to be sacrificed on the Aulter of the Crosse. And the same thing which the Iewes sacrificed through enuie, thinking so they should abolish his name quite out of the earth, we set forth vpon the halowed Aulter for cause of our health, knowing that by this onely remedie life is to be geuen vnto vs, and death*

death to be driuen away. For our Lorde him selfe commaunded vs, to doo thus in remembraunce of him. By this it is made cleare, that if you wil stand to the authoritie of S. Martialis, you must recant your Challenge denying the Priestes to haue power and cōmission to offer vp Christe vnto his Father.

Vpon the false construction you make of S. Martialis, you procede, as if it were the Gospel that you said. But your ground being false (for neither once there nameth he Malachie, and of the Sacrifice he speaketh plainly) al likewise is false, that you buylde thereon, or conclude thereof.

S. Augustine (say you) calleth the same Sacrifice (whereof Malachie speaketh) *Sacrificiū Laudis, & gratiarū actionis*, The Sacrifice of Praise, and of thankesgeuing. And that it should appeare, you allege him truly, you haue by your cotation in the margent, directed your reader vnto two places. But in those places S. Augustine calleth it, *Sacrificium Laudis*, the Sacrifice of praise onely: as for the Sacrifice of thankesgeuing, it is of your owne putting in, S. Augustine there doth not once name it. The mater is not great: yet your vntruth is to be noted. How be it what should I note this? There is in manner nothing by you in any place alleged, which more or lesse by your craft of falsifying, you haue not altered and corrupted.

And though S. Augustine cal the pure Sacrifice prophécied of by Malachie, *the Sacrifice of Praise*, what conclude you thereof? *Ergo*, it is not the Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe? Thus you must conclude, for els it serueth you to no purpose. This being your argument, you shew vs as good Logique, as if one should thus

Aug. contra  
Aduers.  
Legis &  
Propheta-  
rum. c. 20.  
Cont. lit.  
Petilian.  
li. 2. c. 26.



The Sac-  
crifice of  
Praise,  
hovv ge-  
nerall it is.

Luc. 19.  
Mat. 12.  
Math. 10.

August. in  
Psal. 49.

thus prooue your ring not to be golde. This ring is metal, *ergo*, it is not golde. For as metal is general to gold, syl-  
uer, brasse, and to other thinges of that kinde, and com-  
priseth them within his generalitie, so as the Argument  
is foolish, which from the affirmation of the general, de-  
duceth the denial of the special: No whit wiser, nor of  
better force is your reason, *This Sacrifice by reporte of S. Au-  
gustin, is the Sacrifice of Praise, Ergo, it is not the Sacrifice of  
the Body and bloud of Christe*. For the Sacrifice of Praise  
is general to al those Sacrifices, by which the name of  
God is praised, and is not only the Praise of God, that is  
vttered by wordes proceeding out of our mouthe. And  
God is praised by no other thing so much, as by this vn-  
bloudy Sacrifice, representing the oblation of Christe v-  
pon the Crosse. And S. Augustine him selfe writing vpon  
the . 49. Psalme, calleth the liberal almose of Zachæus,  
who said, *I geue the halfe of my goodes to the poore*, and  
the two Mites, that the poore widow gaue to the com-  
mon Boxe, and the Cuppe of colde water, that the  
poore hoste gaue, as it is tolde in the Gospel, eche of  
these (I say) he calleth *Sacrificium Laudis*, a Sacrifice  
of praise. *This Sacrifice of Praise* (saith he) *had Zachæus  
in his Patrimoine, had the Wydow in her purse, had the  
poore hoste in his tubbe*.

So then M. Iewel, what you bring here out of S.  
Augustine, disprooueth nothing at al the Doctrine of  
the Catholique Church, concerning that we cal the  
Sacrifice of the Body and Bloude of Christe celebra-  
ted in the Masse, whereof Saint Irenæus so plainly  
speaketh, that you not beinge hable to auoide the  
force of his cleare woordes, are fayne to shifte your  
handes

handes of it, and turne away al your talke vnto Malachie. Neither is it strange, that S. Augustine calleth it the sacrifice of praise. For whereby is the mercie of God so much praised, as by the Sacrifice of the body and bloude of his Sonne, which we offer vp in remembrance of his Death?

The Sacrifice of the Aulter is the Sacrifice of praise.

But Sir why haue you dissembled, and conceeled these other woordes, with which S. Augustine in the very booke and chapter that you allege, confirmeth the Catholique doctrine on our behalfe against you, and auoucheth that Sacrifice, which most wickedly you denie? his woordes be these. *This Churche is Israel according to the spirite, from which that Israel according to the flesh, is distincted, which serued in the shadowes of sacrifices, by which the Singular Sacrifice was signified, that now Israel according to the spirite offereth vp.* Againe a litle after in the same place. *They that reade, do knowe, what Melchisedech brought forth, when he blessed Abraham. And now they are partakers of it, they see that kinde of Sacrifice, now to be offred vp vnto God ouer al the worlde.*

Augustin.  
contra Ad-  
uers. legis  
& proph.  
h. x. c. 20.

Ibidem.  
Gen. 14.

What is this Singular Sacrifice, which the Churche offereth vp, but the Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe? For what so euer els you reckon, it shal appeare common as wel to Israel according to the flesh, as to Israel according to the spirite. And what sacrifice can you name vs like vnto that which Melchisedech brought forth when he blessed Abraham, which they that reade do knowe (by which manner of speache, as by holding vp a finger, S. Augustin is woont to point the Reader vnto the Sacrifice of the Aulter) and which is now offred vp vnto God ouer al the worlde, but the Sa-

The Singular Sacrifice.

crifice of the body and bloude of Christe, vnder the formes of bread and wine? Thus we thanke you M. Jewel for leading vs vnto those places in S. Augustine, where our Doctrine is so substantially auouched, and your heresie so plainly confuted.

Jewel.

In like sorte Irenæus also expoundeth his owne meaninge, Ecclesia offert Deo cum Gratiarum actione ex Creatura eius. Est ergo *Iren. lib. 4* Altare in Cælo: illuc Preces, & Oblationes nostræ diriguntur: *cap. 34.* The Church offereth vp to God, (not his owne, and onely Sonne, but) a natural thinge of Goddes Creation. Neither is our Altare here in earthe, but in heauen. Thither our Praiers, *Euseb. de* and Sacrifices be directed. So likewise Eusebius saith, Sacrificarius, *Demöstr.* & incendimus Memoriam Magni illius Sacrificij, secundum ea, *lib. 1. c. 10.* quæ ab ipso tradita sunt, Mysteria celebrantes, & gratias Deo pro salute nostra agentes: wee Sacrifice, and offer vp vnto God the Remembrance of that Greate Sacrifice, vsinge the Holy Mysteries accordingly, as Christe hath deliuered them, and giuinge God Thanks for our Saluation.

And that Irenæus meante not any such Real Sacrifice of the Sonne of God, nor may not in any wise so be taken, it is euident by the plaine woordes, that folow, touching the same. For thus he saith, speaking of the very same Sacrifice of the Newe Testamente, that is mentioned by Malachie: Sacrificia non sanctificant hominem, sed conscientia eius, qui offert, existens pura, sanctificat Sacrificium. The Sacrifice dooth not Sanctifie the Man: but the Conscience of the offerer, being pure, sanctifieth the Sacrifice. I troue, *M. Harding* will not saie, The Priest is not sanctified by the Sonne of God: but the Sonne of God is sanctified by the Conscience of the Priest: For that were Blasphemie. And yet thus must he needes saie, if Irenæus meante the Real Sacrificinge of the Sonne of God.

Harding.

Harding.

After al these allegations brought by M. Iewel against the Sacrifice of the Church, whereof not one ought at al helpeth his cause, as I haue now proued: he returneth vnto S. Irenæus againe, and by his accustomed craft of falsifying, he would make his Reader beleue, that S. Irenæus expoundeth his owne meaning so, as the Sacrifice of Christes body and bloude be quite excluded.

VVith  
vvhat sin  
ceritie ad  
truth M.  
Ieuu. had  
leth S. I.  
renæus.

To bring this to passe, it is a woonder to see, what fowle shiftes he maketh. Of this blessed Fathes sentences he snarcheth here a peece, and there a peece, taking the head without the taile, the body without either, dismembring the whole. He ioyneth together wordes, that be aboute thirty lines a sunder, and thereof frameth a sense founding to his false purpose, cleane contrary to the holy Doctors meaning. What shal I say of his owne false gloses, and additions, set forth with that letter, in which the Doctors sayinges be printed, of corrupting the Latine, of making his translation muche worse?

Briefly he demeaneth him selfe so, as who so euer considereth and weigheth the wordes of S. Irenæus, and M. Jewels false sleighes together, he wil thinke, that he hath vtterly abandoned al truth, simplicitie and thamefastnesse, and putteth his whole truste in lying.

Touching then that he first bringeth out of S. Irenæus, I maruel what he meant here to recite it. If he had set forth the whole sentence, as it lyeth in the Doctor, euery simple man would soone haue perceiued, that it furthereth his Challenge nothing at al. Hauing spoken in the foreparte of the sentence of Oblation, that we

M. Ieuvel  
Fovvly  
corrupt  
teth S. I.  
renæus.



must offer vp vnto the Creator *in pure meaning, in faith without Hypocrisie, in firme hope, in seruent loue*: he cometh to the later parte, whereof M. Iewel hath pyked out a litle peece with wyly falshod turning it to his purpose. This it is, *Et hanc oblationem Ecclesia sola pura offert Fabricatori, offerens ei cum gratiarum actione ex creatura eius.* And this oblation the Church onely offereth vp pure vnto our Creator, offering vnto him with geuing thanks out of his creature, that is to say, out of that he hath created. There it foloweth immediatly, *Iudei autem non offerunt. &c.* But the Iewes do not (so) offer, for their handes be ful of bloude. &c.

Iren. li. 4.  
cap. 34.

Fovvle  
corrup-  
tion.

What maketh this for M. Iewel? Mary were al true, that he addeth to his Doctors text, and in case that folowed immediatly, which he adioineth hereunto, and with such termes, as he hath deuised of his owne, and be not in S. Ireneus, that is to say, if blacke were white: it were somewhat perhaps to his purpose. But now he hath falsified altogether, with these wordes falsly infarced into the sentence, *not his owne, and onely Sonne, but a natural thing*: Also by putting these wordes, *Est ergo Altare in celo, Illuc preces, & oblationes nostra diriguntur* next after the other, as though euen there they folowed, which do not folow: but be found at the ende of the chapter. 36. lines after. Which neuerthelesse he translateth also very falsly, as the Reader may see. For these wordes, *Neither is our Altar here in earth*, be of his owne false addition, and be not at al in the Doctour, and most true it is, that we haue Altars in the Church to offer the Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe vpon, which by vertue of his worde be made really present



present : though we haue an Aulter also in heauen.

Where as S. Ireneus is brought in by M. Iewel in the next paragraph, saying, *The sacrifices doo not sanctifie the man, but the conscience of the offerer being pure, sanctifieth the sacrifice* : in that place he speaketh not of the Sacrifice of the Aulter at al, but of the Sacrifices of the olde Testament. What so euer is offered vnto God, it is not the thing offered, that of it selfe sanctifieth him that offereth. But the pure and cleane harte of the party that offereth, sanctifieth the sacrifice, that is to say, as S. Ireneus expoundeth him selfe, *præstat acceptare Deum quasi ab amico*; causeth God to accept it, as at the hand of a frend. Els if a wicked synner (saith the Scripture there also alleged) *kill me a calfe, I had as leaue he killed me a dogge*. In that place therefore he speaketh against them onely, that thought to please God with their outward Sacrifices, whereof he hath no neede, them selues inwardly being wicked, and hauing impure consciences. To make this clearer by examples, and testimonies of Scripture, he allegeth the example of Cain, of the Scribes and Pharisees, and certaine sayinges out of Ieremie, and Esaye.

Esa. 66.

Now in the setting forth of this saying, M. Iewel deceiueth his Reader, but with two lyes atonce. The one is, in that he saith, it foloweth after the other before alleged. For it foloweth not, but goeth before it, as it may be sene in the booke. The other lye is, in that he auoucheth this holy Father to speake this much of the newe oblation of the newe Testament, which is verely false, as I haue now declared.

Tyvo lies  
of M.  
Iewel

Iewel.

Irenę.  
li. 4. c. 34

Angelom<sup>o</sup>  
Antixum.  
lib. 3.

Chrysoſt.  
contra  
Iudaos.  
lib. 3.  
Irenę. lib.  
4. cap. 1.

Eusebius  
de demon.  
lib. 1. c. 10.

But M. Harding bath diuifed a greate many replies to the contrary. First he ſaith, The offering vp of praier, Praises, and Thankſgeuinge can not be called a Newe Sacrifice: for the same was made by Moſes, Aaron, the Prophetes, and other holy menne in the Olde Lawe. This obiection ſerueth wel to control Tertullian, S. Auguſtine, and S. Hierome, and other learned Fathers, that thus haue taken it: vvhō, by M. Hardinges iudgemente, vvrote vnaduiſedly, they knewe not vvhāt. Hereunto Irenęus him ſelfe anſweareth thus: Oblationes hic: Oblationes illic. Sacrificia in Populo Iſrael: Sacrificia in Eccleſia. Sed ſpecies immutata eſt tantum. Quippe cū iam non à Seruis, ſed à Liberis offeruntur. There were Sacrifices in the Olde Teſtament: There be Sacrifices in the newe. There were Sacrifices in the People of Iſrael: there be Sacrifices in the Church. Onely the manner, or forme is changed. For nowe they be offered, not by Bonde menne (as before) but by Free menne. In like ſenſe vvriteth Angelomus. Mandatum nouum ſcribo vobis: non alterum: ſed ipſum, quod dixi Vetus, idem eſt Nouum. I write vnto yowē a Newe Commaundemente: None other, but that I called the Olde, the ſelfe ſame is the Newe. And it is called a Newe ſacrifice, ſaith Chryſoſtome, Bicauſe it proceedeth from a Newe minde, and is offered, not by fiere, and ſmoke, but by Grace, and by the Spirit of God. And in this conſideration Irenęus thinketh, Dauid ſaid vnto the Children of the Church of Chriſt, O ſing vnto the Lord a New Song. M. Hardinge ſaith further, The wordes of Malachie maie in no wiſe be taken for the Oblation of Chriſte vpon the Croſſe. For that, ſaith he, was donne at one time onely, and in one certaine place, in Golgotha without the Gates of Hieruſalem, and not in euery place. Yet M. Hardinge maie eaſily underſtande, that the Remembrance of that Sacrifice, and Thankſgeuinge for the ſame, maie be made at al times, and in al places. And therefore Eusebius as it is noted before, calleth our Sacrifice, Magni illius Sacrificij Memoriam, The Remembrance of that greate Sacrifice: and, the Thankſgeuinge, which vvee yelde vnto God for our Salvation,

Dionysius

Dionysius calleth it, *συμβολικὴν ἑργου γίγναι*, a Figuratiue Sacrifice. And S. Augustine saith, *Cum credimus in Christum, ex ipsis reliquijs cogitationis, Christus nobis quotidie immolatur: VVhen vvee beleue in Christe, euen of the very remanentes of our Cogitation (in vvhat place so euer vve be) Christe is Sacrificed vnto vs euery day. Likevvise S. Hierome saith, Cum audimus Sermonem Domini, Caro Christi, & Sanguis eius in auribus nostris funditur. VVhen vve heare the vvorde of the Lorde, the Fleash of Christ and his Bloude is povvred out into our eares. And, vvhereas M. Hardinge saith further, that the Spiritual Sacrifices of our deuotion cannot altogether be called pure; and therefore can not be the Sacrifices of the Nevve Testamente, it must needes be confessed, that al our righte-ousnes, in respecte of many imperfections, maie be cōpared, as the prophete Esay saith, vnto a filthy clovte. Yet in respecte of Goddes mercie, and in Christe, the Prophete Dauid saith, Thou shalt vvafhe me, and I vvil be vvhiter, then the snowe.*

Howe be it, herein I vvil remit M. Hardinge to the iudgement of them, vvhoes Authorities he can not vveldenie. Eusebius calleth our Praiers, *quod Mundum Sacrificium*, A Pure Sacrifice. Tertullian saith, *VVe make Sacrifice vnto our God, for the safetie of our Emperours, cum est. Pura prece, vvith a Pure Praier. S. Hierome speaking of the Sacrifice of Christian Praiers, saith thus: A pure Sacrifice is Offered vnto me in euery place: not in the Oblations of the Olde Testamente, but in the holynes of the Puritie of the Gospel. To be short S. Paule saith, Volo viros precari in omni loco, leuantes manus Puras: I vvoulde, that menne should praie in al places, lifting vp Pure handes (vnto God)*

Touchinge the Sacrifice of the Lordes Table, Eusebius vvriteth thus: *Ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ τῇ θείᾳ τῇ ὑποστάσει τοῦ θεοῦ προσέφερον*: He gaue vs a Remēbrance in steede of a Sacrifice to offer vp continually vnto God. And this he calleth, *Incruentū, et Rationabile sacrificiū*: The vnbloudy, and Reasonable Sacrifice. This saith Irenaeus, is the Sacrifice of the Nevve Testamente. This Sacrifice the Church receiued of the Apostles: and the same the Apostles receiued of Christe, that made al thinges Nevve.

Ecclesia  
Hierar.  
cap. 3.  
Augustin.  
in Psal. 75.  
Hieron.  
in Psal. 147.

Esai. 64.  
Psal. 50.  
Euseb. de  
demon. li.  
1. cap. 6.  
Orationis

sacrificiū.  
quod Mū-  
dum di-  
cum est.  
Tertul ad  
Scapulā.

Hieron.  
Zachar.  
lib. 2. c. 8.

In sancti-  
tate Euā-  
gelica Pu-  
ritatis.  
1. Tim. 2.  
Eusebius  
de demō-  
stra. lib. 1.

Harding

Harding.

Concerning the Sacrifices of our deuotion (say I in my Answer) that be mere spiritual, they can not truly be called the newe oblation of the new Testament, because they were offered vp to God in the olde Testament, as now they be in the newe. By this M. Iewels shifte is quite auoided, who hath nothing to answer to this place of S. Ireneus reporting Christe, after that he had consecrated his body and bloude, to haue taught vs the newe oblation of the newe Testament, but that it is the pure sacrifice that Malachie speaketh of, that is to say, a contrite harte, or preaching of the Gospel, or prayer, or praise, and thankesgeuing, or, he can not tel what. *This obiection (saith M. Iewel) serueth wel to controul the olde Fathers, namely Tertullian, S. Augustine, S. Hierome.*

No No, M. Iewel, it controulleth the olde Fathers nothing at al. It controulleth our yong Fathers, such as you, and your felowes be, who haue most rashly, most vnlearnedly, most wickedly, and Antichristlike, abolished out of the Churches of England, the most blessed Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe, and now being vrged and pressed with this manifest place of this Auncient and learned Father, who affirmeth it so clearly, ye haue not what to answer. Your whole booke of Replie containeth nothing in effecte, but wyly sleighes, vaine shiftes, shamelesse lyes, and fowle corruptions of the Doctours, and Councels, aboue al measure. But of such Merchandize you make your shew no where more, then in this Article, in which you impugn



pugne the Sacrifice. And of al your Diuisions of the same Article hitherto, in this Diuision the vanitie of your shiftes, appeareth most.

Yet you wil not geue ouer, but that at least to the ignorant people it may seme you haue ynough to say for your selfe, you come againe to S. Irenæus for helpe, and he helpeth your cause nothing at al. Wel, what saith he? *Oblationes hie, Oblationes illic. &c.* The head of the sentence you haue lopped of. This is the whole. *It is the kinde of Oblations, that is reiected: for ther were Oblations both there (among the Iewes) and ther be Oblations also here. There were sacrifices among that people, there be sacrifices in the Church. But the Kinde (or forme) is changed onely, for somuch as they be not bonde men that offer now, but freemen.*

Irenæus  
corrupted  
by M. levv

Iren. lib. 4.  
cap. 34.

What conclude you of al this M. Iewel? What maketh this against the real Sacrifice of the body and bloud of Christe? Mary say you, Thus answereth Irenæus to my Obiection. What was my Obiection? This is that I said in effect, as is before reherfed, that the mere spiritual sacrifices of our deuotion, can not truely be called the New Oblation of the New Testament, bicause they are common to them of both Testamentes. How say you, is not this true? And what haue you to the contrary, in this saying of S. Irenæus?

The kinde, or forme of their, and our sacrifices, is changed, you wil say perhaps. I graunt this much: albe it S. Irenæus referreth this change, not to the sacrifices, but to the offerers: bicause the oldé people of the Synagog were bonde men, and we of the Church are free men. But let it be, as you would haue it. Who



vnderstandeth not the kinde of sacrifices to be changed, for that they killed brute beastes, according to Moyses Lawe, and we kyl them not, as not being vnder that Lawe? But what? Wil you of this conclude, that they offered not vp vnto God the Sacrifices of a contrite harte, of prayers, of praise and thankesgeuing, and such other spiritual sacrifices, bicause they offered vp beastes, and bicause we now offer these? I trowe by that time you haue bethought your selfe, you wil not stande in it. For, be not the Psalmes, and the sermons of the Prophetes full of exhortations, to this ende, that these spiritual oblations should be made, and the like thinges done, that God accepteth for swete smelling sacrifices? Would they so haue exhorted the people, except these thinges ought to haue ben done? And whereas they were to be done, wil you say, there were none, that did them? wil you say, the holy kinges, and Prophetes had not contrite hartes, prayed not, nor praised, ne thanked God? I suppose you wil not say it. To what purpose then pyked you out the former saying of S. Irenæus? What maketh it for you? what maketh it against vs?

No more furthereth that your cause, which without opening and circumstance you allege out of Angelomus, and S. Chrysostome. How much better had you done, if confessing the truth, you had leaste out these obscure and impertinent places, and had reherfed vnto your Reader certaine other most plaine sayinges out of S. Irenæus, whereof this is one written in the same chapter, out of which you piked the peeces that here you haue patched together. *Quomodo constabit eis, &c.* How shal they be assuredly certified (saith this blessed Martyr)

tyr) that bread whereon thanks be geuen, to be the body of their Lorde, and that Cuppe to be (the Cuppe) of his bloude, if they wil not say, he is the Sonne of the Creatour of the worlde, that is to say, his Worde, whereby the Vine bringeth forth fruite, founteines (of wine) do runne, and which (for bread to be had) geueth first grasse, afterward an eare, and then at lengthful wheate in the eare? Againe how say they, that the flesh commeth into corruption, and receiveth not life, which is fedde of the body and bloude of our Lorde? Therefore either let them change their opinion, or cease from offering up the thinges, that are before said.

An other like saying there auouching our doctrine, is this. *As the bread that is of the earth, receiuing the calling vpon of God, is not now common bread, but the Euchariste, consisting of two thinges, earthly, and heauenly: So our bodies receiuing the Euchariste, be not now corruptible, but haue hope of the Resurrection.*

The Eucharist consisteth of two thinges.

How plaine and cleare testimonie haue we in these sayings, for the truth, and Real presence of our Lordes body and bloude in the blessed Sacrament, for the Oblation of the same, for the most soueraine effecte, that thereby is wrought in our bodies nourished and fedde therewith? At these M.Iewel you closed vp your eyes, bicause they confounde the pride and wicked folie of your Challenge: other woordes, and patches of sentences, you pryed and hunted after, by which you might seme to auoid the cleare authoritie in this Diuision alleged against you out of S. Irenæus, yet when you haue al said, and shifted, your Replie is founde to weake, and insufficient.

This sense  
of  
S. Ireneus  
graueth  
M. Iewell

Bicause you feele your selfe much pressed, and as it were borne downe, with the weight of this plaine testimonie of S. Ireneus (*Christe hauing confessed of the bread, that it was his body, and of the cuppe, that it was his blood, taught his Apostles the new oblation of the newe Testament*) faine would you finde some way, how to ease your selfe of it, and therefore haue you looked ouer (as it semeth) al your Notebookes, and searched the Doctours farre and neare, to happen vpon some for your relief, but none can you finde. And here you shewe your selfe to be graueled with these plaine wordes, *Novi Testamenti noua docuit oblationem*, Christe taught the newe oblation of the new Testament. To auoide this newe oblation, that so much combreth you, you haue deuised a new policie, which would serue you for some shewe and colour, were it not altogether stuffe of your owne counterfeyting and forging. What is that? Beholde Reader, and consider of it diligently.

Thus saith M. Iewel. *It is called a newe Sacrifice, saith Chrysostome*, (now folow the wordes pretended to be S. Chrysostomes in the distinct letter, that he putteth the Doctours sayings in) *bicause it proceedeth from a new minde, and is offered, not by fiere and smoke, but by Grace, and by the Spirite of God.* But where saith S. Chrysostome this much? You haue put it in the letter of the Fathers sayings, tel vs where we may finde the cause thus declared, why this oblation of the newe Testament, is called, Newe. By your cotation in the margent you send vs vnto *Chrysost. contra Iudeos. lib. 3.* but there we finde no such thing at al. Neither bethey Bookes, but Orations, that he wrote against the Iewes, and so Erasmus, who

who translated that worke, calleth them.

Mary in the second Oration we haue trakte you, and founde out the place, that you abuse: abuse, I say, for it maketh wholly against you. There, S. Chrysostom, to proue vnto the Iewe, to whom he speaketh, that both their Lawe, and ther Sacrifice is ended, and abolished, and that an other Sacrifice ~~is~~ come in place of theirs, which is pure, and is to be offered vp through al the worlde, allegeth the prophecie of Malachie, *from the rising of the Sunne to the going downe, &c. a pure Sacrifice shal be offered vnto my name.* Vpon this prophecie he stayth him selfe, and declareth at large, how it ought to be vnderstanded, and how the Prophete may not seme to be repugnant to Moyse, who appointeth the Sacrifice of the Iewes vnto one onely place, and how, and for what respecte, the Sacrifice that Malachie speaketh of, is pure, whiche S. Chrysostome calleth, *Sacrificium nostrum*, our Sacrifice. Among other many wordes spoken in praise of this our pure Sacrifice, thus he saith there.

*If one conferre this Sacrifice with theirs, he shal finde an exceding great difference, so that according to the proportion of comparison, this alone may deserue to be called pure. And looke what S. Paule said of the Lawe, and Grace, that, that was not glorified at al, which was glorified, in comparison of the high Glorie: the same here also iustly we may say, to wit, that this Sacrifice compared with that (of the Lawe) ought alone to be called pure. Then folowe the wordes which M. Iewel hath by falsifying, and fowle corruption abused to his purpose. Non enim per fumum ac nidorem, non per sanguinem ac*

M Iewve  
fouly ab  
useth S.  
Chrysost.

Malach. 1.

VVhi our  
sacrifice is  
of Mala  
chicall  
the Pure  
Sacrifice,  
after the  
minde of  
S. Chrys  
ostome.  
2. Cor. 3.



Chryso.  
oratioe. 2  
contra lu-  
daos.

Chryso.  
misrepor-  
ted by M.  
Iewell.

*redemptionis precia, sed per spiritus gratiam offertur.* For it is not offered by smoke and gresy sauour, not by bloude and prices of redemption, but by grace of the spirite. With these wordes he rendreth the cause, why the Sacrifice of the Church, is of Malachie called pure, and not why it is called Newe, as M. Iewel hath peruer-  
ted the sentence.

Compare good Reader this Repliers wordes with S. Chrysostomes wordes, and thou shalt espye, what a corrupter and falsifier he is of the Doctours. Wherefore seing he can finde no helpe at S. Chrysostomes handes (whom here he hath much iniured, and misre-ported) nor at the handes of any other Doctor, nor can shewe vs what Sacrifice that is, which S. Ireneus calleth *the newe Sacrifice, or newe Oblation of the newe Testament that Christ taught, when he said of the bread and Cuppe, this is my body, this is my bloude*, but the Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe: with right he may be required to subscribe, and yeelde. Which wil be best for him to doo, least the time come, when not yeelding he shalbe taken prysoner, and for his heresie and impenitent harte, be caste into the owtward darkenes, where shal be weeping, and gnashing of teeth.

Matt. 22.

Bicause M. Iewel harpeth so much vpon the prophcie of Malachie, and putteth the confidence of his cause therein, and hath taken his aduantage of S. Chrysostome by falsifying his wordes: let vs see how litle cause he had so to doo, and how much S. Chrysostome being truly alleged, proueth in that very place which M. Iewel bringeth, treating of Malachie, the Catholique  
assertion.



assertion. Whereas Moyses forbad sacrifice to be made in any other place, but in that place whiche our Lorde had chosen, and Malachie saith, that the pure Sacrifice is to be offered vp in euery place from the East to the West: that these two should not seme to be repugnant, S. Chrysostome saith, that Moyses spake of one Sacrifice, and Malachie prophecied of an other.

Deut. 16.

To prooue this, he asketh this question. *Vnde hoc declaratur?* Whereby is this declared? There for declaration and proufe hereof, among other thinges he bringeth the argument of the place. For (saith he) *Malachie foretolde that this worship should be celebrated, not in one Citie, as the Iewish sacrifice was, but from the rising of the Sunne, to the going downe.* Then folowe these woordes: *Præterea ex Sacrificij modo, siquidem puram illam appellans, declarauit de qua loqueretur.* Furthermore this is declared by the manner of the Sacrifice, for in that he calleth that oblation (or worship) pure, he hath declared of what oblation (or worship) he spake. This much S. Chrysostome there.

Cōclusiō  
gathered  
out of S.  
Chrysost.  
against  
M. levv.

Hereof and of that S. Chrysostome saith in that place, these Conclusions may be gathered against M. Iewel.

The First Conclufion. Malachie in S. Chrysostomes iudgement speaketh of such a Sacrifice, as for commendation whereof he might seme repugnant to Moyses. But in respecte of those, which are mere spiritual Sacrifices, of which onely M. Iewel wil Malachie to be expounded, as of a contrite harte, of prayer, of praise, and

and thankesgeuing, Malachie can not seme repugnant to Moyses, bicause Moyses neuer forbad them: *Ergo*, the Sacrifice that Malachie speaketh of, is not to be vnderstanded of mere spiritual sacrifices.

2. The .2. Conclusion. Malachies prophecie is of such a Sacrifice after the mynde of S. Chrysostome, as the celebration whereof should abandon, and quite put away the Priestthoode, and Sacrifices of the Iewes. But the mere spiritual Sacrifices of our deuotion, whereto only M. Iewel draweth the prophecie of Malachie, haue not that power and effecte. For they continued with their Sacrifices, as they do with ours: *Ergo*, Malachie is not to be vnderstanded of the mere spiritual Sacrifices.

3. The .3. Conclusion. S. Chrysostome speaking of the Sacrifice mentioned by Malachie, vseth these wordes, *Pradixit hanc culturam celebrandam*, he fortolde that this worship should be celebrated, not in one citie, &c. But of any of the mere spiritual sacrifices of our deuotion, no learned Father euer said, that it is a worship to be celebrated, nor are these termes couenient for them, or for any of them, for they are not, properly to speake, a worship by vs to be celebrated, but thereby and therewith we doo celehrate and worship God: *Ergo*, Malachie by S. Chrysostomes doctrine, speaketh not specially of the mere spiritual sacrifices of mannes harte, but of an other Sacrifice outwardly celebrated.

4. The .4. Conclusion. The Sacrifice that Malachie prophecied of, S. Chrysostom saith it is such, as is declared what it is, by the manner of it. But a thing can not be declared what it is by the manner, onlesse the manner be external, and sensible, so as it may be perceiued by sense,

sense, and the mere spiritual sacrifices of mans inward deuotion be not such: *Ergo*, Malachie meant not of them, but of another Sacrifice.

The . 5 . Conclusion . Malachie by the exposition of S. Chrysostome speaketh of that Sacrifice, which properly is *Nostrum*, that is to say, ours, belonging to vs, that be of the newe Testament. But the Sacrifice of a contrite harte, of Praiers, Praise, and thankesgeuing be theirs of the olde Testament, as well as ours: *Ergo*, of that kinde of Sacrifice he spake not.

That I make an ende of Conclusions, the sixth and last Conclusion may be this. By interpretation of S. Chrysostome, the Sacrifice that Malachie prophesied of, is pure in the most excellent degree of purenesse. But the spiritual Sacrifices proceeding from the harte of man, be not pure in the highest degree of purenesse: *Ergo*, it is an other kinde of Sacrifice, which Malachie foretolde.

So then it is, if M. Iewel can not declare and clearely prooue vnto vs, that Malachie prophesying of a mere spiritual Sacrifice of mans deuotion, might reasonably seme to S. Chrysostom to be repugnant to Moses, that such a sacrifice should abolish the Iewes sacrifices, that it is called a worship to be celebrated by vs, that it is declared what it is, by the external manner of it, that in proper and right speache it ought to be called our Sacrifice, or the Sacrifice of the newe Testament, and to conclude, that it is most singularly and most excellently pure: if I say he can not make good these pointes, as to euery man of meane iudgement and learning most certaine it is, he can not iudge discrete Reader, how good reason we haue, to require him to yeelde, and to de-

ceine the worlde no more by alleging the authoritie of S. Chryſoſtome, as though he ſo vnderſtoode Malachies Prophecie, and conſequently were contrary to S. Irenæus.

That S. Chryſoſtome is to be vnderſtanded of the Sacrifice of the Aulter, In orat. 2. contra Iudeos.

Luc. 22. Math. 26.

And on the other ſide, who is ſo wilfully blinde, that ſeeth not al theſe properties to be agreeable vnto the Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Chriſte? For this is not contrary to Moyses, but it is the perfection of Moyses, the truth of the figure, the body of the ſhadow: the comming of this, hath aboliſhed the Iewiſh Sacrifices: by this God is moſt highly praiſed; thanked, and honored, and this in ſelfe is a worſhip moſt holyly to be celebrated: This, what it is, moſt plainly by the manner of offering is declared; for the Prieſt ſaith in the perſon of Chriſt, as by him he is taught to do, *this is my body, which is geuen for you, this is my blood, which is ſhed for you, and for many*: This by al right is our Sacrifice, in ſo much that if this be not ours, I meane of the new Teſtament, whereas beſides this ther is none other external and real ſacrifice: then haue we none at al, that is external and real. Which if it were true, then neither had we a Prieſthoode, nor Lawe: and ſo then were we a people neither of the one Teſtament, nor of the other. To concludẽ, this, and none other but this, is, touching the ſubſtance of it, the pure Sacrifice in higheſt and ſupreme degree of pureneſſe. For what cã be thought purer then that body, which was conceiued of the holy Ghoſt, and borne of the moſt pure Virgin, which is the proper body of the Worde? To the heape of Allegations, which M. Jewel in the ende of this Diuiſion hath as it were with ſcoopes, caſte together, becauſe they importe little ſubſtance, and be,

ſome



some vntruly, and al without finceritie brought in, the circumstance of the places, whens they be taken out not declared, the opening whereof would require many wordes, which should weary rather then profite the reader: I esteeme a iuste and particuler Answer vtterly nedelesse, specially what so euer is of any importance, being already sufficiently answered.

The . 10 . Diuision.

The Answer.

**N**OW let vs heare what S. Cyprian hath written to this purpose. Bicause his workes be common, to be shorter, I wil rehearse his woordes in English. If in the Sacrifice, which is Christe, none but Christe is to be folowed, soothly it behooued vs to obey, and doo that, which Christe did, and commaunded to be done. For if Iesus Christe our Lorde and God, very he him selfe be the high Priest of God the Father, and him selfe first offered Sacrifice to God the Father, and commaunded the same to be doone in his Remembrāce: Verily that Priestes dooth occupie the office of Christe truly, who dooth by imitation the same thing, that Christe did. And then he offereth to God the Father in the Church a true, and a perfite Sacrifice, yf he beginne to offer right so as he seeth Christe him selfe to haue offered. This farre S. Cyprian. Howe can this Article be auouched in more plaine woordes?

Q Q ij

he saith



he saith that Christe offered him selfe to his Father in his Supper, and likewise commaunded vs to doo the same.

Here wee haue prooued, that it is lawful, and hath alwaies from the beginning of the Newe Testamente bene lawful for the Priestres to offer vp Christe vnto his Father, by the testimonies of three holy Martyrs, two Greekes, and one Latine, most notable in sundry respectes, of antiquitie, of the rounne they bare in Christes Church, of Learninge, of Constancie, of Faith stedfastly keapte to Death, suffered in places of fame, and knowledge, at Paris, at Lions, at Carthage.

Iewel.

This place of S. Cyprian, as it not once toucheth the real Sacrificinge of Christ vnto his Father, so it viterly condemneth the Communion vnder One Kinde: the Common Praiers in a strange vnknown tongue: and brisly the whole disorder, and abuse of M. Hardinges Masse.

But S. Cyprian saith, In Sacrificio, quod Christus est: In the Sacrifice, that is Christe. If M. Harding thinke to finde great aduantage in these wordes, it may please him to Remember, that S. Augustin saith, *Auguſt. in* Illis Petra erat Christus: Vnto the Iewes the Rocke was Christ. *Iohan.* Verily, the Sacrifice after the order of Melchisedek, vvhich is the Propitiation for the Sinnes of the world, is onely Iesus Christ, the Sonne of God vpon the Crosse. And the ministracion of the Holy Mysteries, in a phrase, and manner of speache, is also the same Sacrifice: because it laieth foorth the Death, and bloud of Christ so plainly, and so euidently before our eyes. *Auguſt. in* So saith S. Augustine, The very Remembrance of Christes Passiõ. *Psalm. 20* sturreth vp such motions within vs, as if we sawe Christ presently

sently hauing vpon the Crosse. Vpon vvhich vwoordes the Common  
*Glose noteth thus:* Christus immolatur, id est, Christi immolatio re- *De Confe.*  
 præsentatur, & fit memoria passionis: Christe is sacrificed, that is *Dis. 2. Se-*  
 to say, The Sacrifice of Christe is represented, and there is made *mel.*  
 a Remembrance of his passion. So S. Cyprian saith, Vinum expri-  
 mit sanguinem: In Aqua populus intelligitur: In Vino sanguis *Cypri. lib.*  
 ostenditur. Itaq; passionis eius mentionem in Sacrificijs facimus. *2. epist. 3.*  
 Passio enim Domini est Sacrificium, quod offerimus. The V Vine  
 sheweth the Bloude, in the VVater we vnderstande the people:  
 The Bloude is expressed in the V Vine. And therefore in our sa-  
 crifices we make mention of Christes passion. For the Sacrifice,  
 that we offer, is the passion of Christe. *As the ministration of the ho.* *De Confe.*  
*ly Comunien is the Death, and Passion of Christ, euen so, and in like sort,* *Distinct. 2.*  
*and sense may the Sacrifice thereof be called Christe. therefore S. Grego-* *Quid sit.*  
*rie saith,* Christus in seipso immortaliter viuens, iterum in hoc  
 Mysterio moritur. Eius Caro in populi Salutē patitur: Christ liuig *De Conf.*  
 immortally in him selfe, dieth againe in this Mysterie. His Fleas h *Dist. 2.*  
 suffereth *(in the Mysterie)* for the Saluation of the people. *I reckon,* *Quid sit.*  
 M. Harding vvil not say, that Christe Dieth in deede, according to the *In Glosa.*  
 force, and sounde of these vwoordes, or that his Fleashe verily, and in dede *Chryso. in*  
 is tormented, and suffereth in the Sacrament. S. Gregorie better expoun- *Acta. Ho-*  
 deth him selfe in this vvise: Hoc Sacramentum Passionem Vnigeni- *mil. 21.*  
 ti Filij imitatur: This Sacrament expresseth or representeth the *Beda expo-*  
 Passion of the Onely begotten Sonne. And the very Barbarous *nens illud.*  
*Glose touching the same saith,* Christus Moritur, & Patitur, id est, *Sicut Mo-*  
 Mors, & Passio Christi repræsentatur: Christ Dieth, and Suffe- *ses exalta-*  
 reth, that is to say, Christes Death, and Passion is represented. *uit, &c.*

So S. Chrysostom saith, In Mysterijs mors Christi perficitur: The *Iohan. 3.*  
 Death of Christe is wrought in the Mysteries. So saith Beda, Exal- *Hieron. in*  
 tatio Serpentis Aenei Passio Redemptoris nostri in Cruce: The *Psal. 97*  
 lifting vp of the Brasen Serpent is the Passion of our Redeemer *Ambro. de*  
 vpon the Crosse. So saith S. Hierome, Quotidiē nobis Christus *Virginib.*  
 Crucifigitur: Vnto vs Christe is daily Crucified. So S. Ambrose, *August.*  
 Christus quotidie immolatur: Christe is daily sacrificed. So S. *Quast. Ea*  
 Augustine, Tunc vnicuique Christus occiditur, cum credit occi- *uāge. lib. 2*

Hieron ad  
Damas.

sum : Then is Christe slaine to euery man , when he beleeueth  
that Christe was slaine. To conclud, so S. Hierome saith , Sempet  
Christus credentibus immolatur : Vnto the faithfull Christe is e-  
uermore sacrificed. Thus may the Sacrifice of the Holy Communion  
be called Christe : to witte , euen so , as the ministracion of the same  
is called the Passion , or the Death of Christe.

Harding.

The first sentence of your Replie in this Diuision M.  
Iewel, consisteth of . 4. particles , and echē of them is  
an impudent lye . By the spiteful woordes you vtter a-  
gainst the most holy Masse , you shewe vs with what  
stampe you are coined . As for S . Cyprian , neither  
doth he in this place condemne the Church for mini-  
string the Communion vnder one kinde , nor for ha-  
uing the publike Church seruice in the Latine tongue.  
Which in these Westerne partes of Christendome is  
not , as you cal it , a strange vnknewen tongue , but con-  
trarywise a tongue among al other best knowen in gene-  
ral , and common to al nations of the West.

M. Iewell  
standeth  
altoget-  
her vpon  
certaine  
precise  
 termes.

Touching the Sacrifice of the body and bloude of  
Christe , so clearely by S. Cyprian here auouched , that  
so it is , you woulde neuer haue denyed , had not you  
put the whole confidence of your cause in lying , and  
denying most euident truthes . And now therefore I  
must prooue against such a cauiller and wrangler , as  
you are , that there is light , where the Sunne shyneth.  
And here once againe you thinke to finde a lurking cor-  
ner in your precise termes of *the real sacrificing of Christe  
vnto his Father* : as though I prooued not that which in  
this Article you denie , except the truth be affirmed in  
the

the same forme of wordes, which your selfe haue deuised. If you had good mater, I trow you would not thus stand only vpon termes.

But let vs pul you out of your lurking corner, as it were out of Cacus Denne, and bring you abroade into the light. Answer me Sir: Will it not appeare by this place of S. Cyprian, that Christe offered him selfe vnto his Father at his laste Supper? Be not these his very wordes, *Iesus Christe our Lorde and God first offered a Sacrifice to God the Father, and commaunded the same to be done in his Remembraunce?* What Sacrifice was this? An euident place of S. Cyprian for the Sacrifice of the Aulter. Cyprian. lib. 2. epist. 3.

It was not the Sacrifice of the Crosse pardy. For that very same Sacrifice was not commaunded to be made againe; it was once made for euer by Christe him selfe.

What can you name, but the vnbloudy Sacrifice of his body and bloude? For if you name vs the mere spiritual sacrifices of deuotion, as Prayer, Praise, Thankesgeuing, or any such other the like: you must remember, Christe did not first of al sacrifice the same. For the Patriarkes, and Prophetes did so, long before Christe was incarnate.

What is it then? S. Cyprian telleth it him selfe expressly, saying, *Christe is the Sacrifice, In Sacrificio quod Christus est.* He speaketh of such a Sacrifice, in which the Priest occupieth the roome, and doth the office of Christ truly, and in doing whiche, the Prieste by imitation doth the same thing that Christe did. Then what did Christe, and where did he that the Prieste is commaunded to folowe? What neede I to stande vpon it? Who knoweth not, whereof S. Cyprian treateth in that Epistle to Cæcilius, and what Christe did at his Supper? Cyprian. ad Cæciliu.

He tooke



Math. 26.  
Luc. 22.  
1. Cor. 11.  
Cyprian.  
lib. 2. epi  
stol. 3.

He tooke bread, and then the Cuppe, he gaue thanks, blessed, and consecrated his body and bloud, sayinge, *this is my Body, this is my Bloud*, and so offered vp (as S. Cyprian saith) *the same thing, which Melchisedech had offered, that is to say, bread and wine, to wit, his owne body and bloude*. Which Body and Bloude, bicause both natures be inseparably vnited together in one person, he calleth also by the name of Christe. *In Sacrificio quod Christus est*, in the Sacrifice which Christ is, for here *Christus*, is the nominatiue case to the verbe, *est*.

Whereas then Christe offered Christe to his Father, at his Supper, and comaunded Priestes to doo the same in Remembrance of him, vntil he come, that being in eue-ry respecte lawful, which he commaundeth: it foloweth, that Priestes haue authoritie to offer vp Christe, who is the Sonne of God, vnto his Father, which is the pointe of this Article, that M. Iewel denieth. And thus is the real sacrificing of Christe vnto his Father, prooued by S. Cyprian, real, I say, not in respecte of the manner of sacrificing that was vppon the Crosse, but of the Body and Bloude really present, and being the real substance of this commemoratiue Sacrifice.

Here I needed not to procede further in this Diuision, my Answer to the Challenge being so sufficiently iustified touching the vnbloudy Sacrifice, and this being prooued by S. Cyprians testimonie, as it was prooued before by testimonie of S. Irenæus, that it is not onely lawful, but also dutiful for Priestes, to offer vp Christe vnto his Father. Yet bicause M. Iewel (who from the beginning neuer intended to yeelde, how plaine mater so euer were prooued against him) commeth now in  
with



with his Phrases, hauing no plaine and directe authoritie whereby to prooue his negatiue doctrine: Let vs see, what pith his obscure phrases, and tropical speeches do conteine.

Where as S. Cyprian saith plainly, *Christe is the Sacrifice* (meaning the substance of the Sacrifice celebrated at the Supper and now at the Aulter) he willeth me to remember, that S. Augustine saith, *Petra erat Christus*, the Rocke was Christe. For that he putteth vnto S. Augustine this worde *illis*, interpreting it of the Iewes: it is his owne addition, S. Augustine hath it not. But what concludeth he of this? Not onely S. Augustine, but S. Cyprian also in this very Epistle, and first of al S. Paule saith, *the Rocke was Christe*. I say to M. Iewel estsones, it may please him to remember, that S. Augustine expoundeth him selfe immediatly in the next sentence, saying, *Petra Christus in signo*. The Rocke was Christe in a signe, that is to say, the Rocke was not Christe in substance, and in deede, but signified Christe. If he intende thus to conclude, as the Replie semeth to reporte, As the Rocke was Christe, so Christe is the Sacrifice: but the Rocke was not Christe in deede: Ergo, Neither Christe is the Sacrifice: If he make this Argument, I denie his *Maior*, or first Proposition. For the Rocke was Christe in signe onely, but Christes body and bloud Really made present, by the almighty power of the Worde, is in deede the substance of the commemorative Sacrifice. Wherefore no likenesse touching the Phrase being between these two Propositions, *the Rocke was Christe*, and, *Christe is the Sacrifice*: the one can not rightly be applyed to ouerthrowe the other. And

August. in  
loan. tra-  
ctat. 26.

1. Cor. 10.

The Rock  
was  
Christe.

RR. whereas

whereas M. Jewel maketh his colourable aduantage by making Sacrifice the nominatiue case to the verbe in this ſaing of S. Cyprian, *In Sacrificio quod Christus est*: he is to be tolde, that he misconstrueth it, and that false cōstructiō maketh no proufe. For S. Cyprian ſaith not, *the Sacrifice is Christ*, which also is true, and that taketh M. Jewel for his purpose: but, *Christe is the Sacrifice*. In cōsideratiō wherof the figuratiue ſaying, and the Phraſe of the Rock, and the great number of his other phraſes, ſerueth not his turne.

That the  
Sacrifice  
after the  
order of  
Melchise-  
dech was  
not onely  
vpon the  
Croſſe, but  
also at the  
Supper.

Hieronym.  
in Psalm.  
109.

Theophyl.  
in Matth.  
cap. 28.

Vpon this false cōstructiō of S. Cyprians ſaying how ſo euer he procedeth, ſpeaking cōfuſely of the ſacrifice, which is after the order of Melchisedek, and of the propitiation for the ſynnes of the worlde: this I acknowledge, that onely Ieſus Chriſte the Sonne of God, is the propitiatorie Sacrifice for the ſynnes of the worlde, and that ſucha Sacrifice in moſt perfit wiſe, he was vpō the Croſſe, yea also after th' order of Melchisedek, wher, as Melchisedek offred bread and wine, ſo he offered vp his body and bloud, the true bread, and the true wine, as s. Ierom ſaith. For al though he expreſſed the ſhadowes of al Aarons ſacrifices vpon the Croſſe, yet ther he was a Prielt after the order of Melchisedek. For ſo S. Paule in th' Epistle to the Hebrues ſheweth, by the diſſimilitude of both Prielt hods. But that he was a ſacrifice after th' order of Melchisedek only, when he hoong vpō the Croſſe, that I denie. For he was a Prielt, and also a ſacrifice after th' order of Melchisedek at his laſt ſupper. at what time offering vp his body, and bloud vnder the formes of bread and wine, he began to execute th' office of the Prielt hod after th' order of Melchisedek, and taught his Diſciples the way, how after his death to make the ſame oblatiō. Vpon which cōſideratiō Theophylact, as it is before reherſed, ſaith, *Tunc imolauit ſe-  
ipſum,*

*ipsū, ex quo tradidit Discipulis corpus suū*, he sacrificed him selfe, at the time he deliuered his body to his Disciples. And S. Austine more plainly, expounding this place of Ecclesiastes, *Non est bonū homini, nisi quod māducabit et bibet*, wher he saith thus. *Quid credibilius etc.* What is more credible we should thinke Salomō means by those wordes, then that pertaineth to the participatiō of this table, which Christ him selfe a Priest and mediator of the new Testamēt doth exhibit after the order of Melchisedek, of his body and bloud? For that sacrifice did succede al other sacrifices of the olde Testament, which were offred in the shadow of this to come. A litle before in the same chapter speaking of the Table which Christe prepared with bread and wine, he geueth an euident testimonie for the Sacrifice and Priesthod after th' order of Melchisedek, where he saith thus, *Vbi apparet etiā sacerdotiū secundū ordinē Melchisedech*, that is to say, where also appeareth the priesthod after the order of Melchisedek. By this authoritie it is cleare, that Christ at the table, wher the blessed Sacramēt was first instituted, and is now daily celebrated in memorie of his Passiō, doth exhibite that which is a sacrifice after the order of Melchisedek, which can be nothing els, but the sacrifice of his body and bloude vnder the formes of bread and wine. That Christ merited the forgeuenes, and propitiatiō of the sinnes of the world vpo the Crosse only, that I gladly graunt.

As for the Sacrifice and Priesthode after the order of Melchisedek, S. Augustine in an other place saith, that Christe (at his Supper) instituted a Sacrifice of his body and bloude according to the order of Melchisedek. *De corpore et sāguine suo*, of his body and bloud, saith he, signifying his body and bloud to be the mater of the Sacrifice.

August. de  
ciuit. Dei,  
lib. 17. cap  
pit. 20.

August. in  
Psalm. 33.  
concion 2.

Lo here againe it is plainely auouched, that Christe instituted a Sacrifice after the order of Melchisedech before he was nayled vpon the Crosse, yea the Sacrifice of his body and bloude. For to the time of the Supper this is to be referred, when both he taught them how, and commaunded them to sacrifice.

Ibidem in  
Psal. 33.  
Cecion. 1.

Of this Sacrifice S. Augustine in the sermon there nexte before, geueth vs a manifest testimonie, where he saith. *Nondum erat Sacrificium corporis & sanguinis Domini, quod fideles norunt, & qui Euangelium legerunt, quod sacrificium nunc diffusum est toto orbe terrarum.* The Sacrifice of the body and bloude of our Lorde was not yet in place (he speaketh of the time when beastes were sacrificed) which the faithful do knowe, and they that haue read the Gospel. Which Sacrifice is now spreade abroad in al the worlde. Let M. Iewel tel vs, what is this Sacrifice of the body and bloude of our Lorde, that is diffused and spread ouer al the worlde, besides that is celebrated in the Masse: and then we wil say he saith somewhat to his purpose.

**N**OW M. Iewel departeth from our special point, which is (as it is auouched by S. Ireneus, S. Cyprian and others) that Christe offered his body and bloude vnto God at his Supper, and commaunded the same sacrifice to be offered by Priestes of the newe Testament in remembrance of his death: and commeth to proue that, whereof no question was moued: That the Ministration of the holy Mysteries in a phrase and manner of speech, is the same Sacrifice. How be it what he meaneth by his ministerlike termes, wel I wote not. He sheweth



sheweth him selfe inconstant in the vse of them . In this one Diuision, he calleth it first, *The ministration of the holy Mysteries*. Nexte, *the Ministration of the holy Communion*. Thirdly, *the Sacrifice of the holy Communion*. For the same he allegeth a certaine saying, as he telleth vs, out of S. Augustine vpon the .20. Psalme, where he hath no such saying at al. The place he meaneth is in Gratian. Where it speaketh not of M. Iewels Ministration of the holy Mysteries (which I trow in his meaning is the Ministration of bread and wine at the Geuenian Communion, for what other holy Mysteries they haue I knowe not) nor of the Sacrifice, that is daily celebrated in the Churche, but of the solemnitie which once in the yere vpon Maundie thursday, and Good fryday, is celebrated with special ceremonies in remembrance of Christes death and passing out of this mortal life. *This Annierfary recordation* saith he (for so he calleth it) *doth represent that which was once done, and causeth vs so to be moued, as if we saw our Lorde present on the Crosse.*

*De Consecrat. dist. 2. Semel.*

Neither noteth the Glose, vpon these wordes, that you reporte of it M. Iewel, but vpon the worde *immolatur*, which is in the next chapter folowing. For where-as Gratian reciteth S. Augustine speaking thus of the Sacrifice, *semel immolatus est in semetipso Christus, & tamen quotidie immolatur in sacramento*, Christe was once sacrificed in him selfe, (that is to say) he suffered once in his owne person in the forme of man) and yet he is daily sacrificed in a Sacrement: vpon this last worde *immolatur*, the Glose, hath noted, that you bring, *The Sacrifice*, (meaning the bloudy Sacrifice vpon the Crosse) *is represented, and a Memorie of the Passion is made.*

*August. epist. 23. ad Bonifacium.*



In the former chapter is declared, what is done at one certaine time in the yere, touching the representation, and remembrance of Chriſtes paſſion, in the nexte, what is done daily. M. Iewel hauing alledged the firſt, applyeth vnto it, the gloſe of the ſecond. And al is quite beſides his purpoſe. For how hangeth this Argument together? The Seruice of the Church in the holy weke before Eaſter, as the reading of the Paſſion, creaping to the Croſſe, the ſalutatio of the Croſſe, and other Ceremonies in olde time vſed in England, and yet vſed through the whole Catholique Church, do liuely represent vnto vs Chriſtes Paſſio: *Ergo*, the Prieſt doing, that Chriſte did at his Supper, and that he is cōmaunded to doo, doth not offer vp his body and bloud to God. Logike muſt nedes be good cheape, where ſuch Argumentes be made good chaffer.

And forasmuch as M. Iewel him ſelfe (who craketh ſo much of Antiquitie, and wil al controuerſies to be tried by the Fathers of the firſt. 600. yeres) is not a ſhamed here to craue helpe of the Common Gloſe, which within few lines after he calleth barbarous: as he hath brought it againſt vs, though in deede it be not againſt vs at al: let him patiently ſuffer vs to tel him, what he ſawe in the ſame Gloſe, in that very place, that is cleare againſt him. In this part of this diſtinction (ſaith the Gloſe) *It is proued, that Chriſte once hauing dyed, can dye no more, (yet) the truth of his fleſh, and of his bloude is alwaies in the Sacrament of the Auſter.* And there it ſetteth forth. 10. verſes declaring the ſumme of the catholike faith touching the moſt bleſſed Sacrament. In which perhappes M. Iewel may eſpie a fault touching the rules of Poetrie, but verely touching the rules of faith, he ſhal finde no faulte. Al

concei-

M. Iewel  
craue  
helpe of  
the Gloſe,  
that he  
calleth  
Barba-  
rous.

De Conſe-  
crat. Diſt.  
2. Semel.  
In Gloſſa.

containing excellent sense, for auoiding prolixitie, to gratifie the Reader, here I wil reherse two.

*Clauditur hoc vase nostri pia victima Phasæ.*

*Ibidem.*

*Viuu salutaris, semel in cruce semper in aris.* Here is inclosed in this vessel the diuine hoste of our Paschal lambe: the hoste that lyueth, that is healthful, that was once on the Crosse, and alwaies is on the Aulters. Go forth M. Iewel, and stil for lacke of good mater that maketh for you, allege vs places, where your heresie is most euidently confuted and condemned.

Stil you harpe vpon a wrong string, alleging S. Cypriā, and S. Gregorie, to disproue that which you feine me to say, or at least mistake me to say, as reporting the wordes of S. Cyprian. Your parte had ben to yelde, or to shewe good reason, why you deny Christe, or, (which is al one) Christes flesh and bloude, to be offered vp. vnto God by Priestes, to whom in the Apostles he said, *doo ye this in my remembrance.* I go not about in this Diuisiō to proue, that the Sacrifice is Christ, wherof in your owne conceit you haue stuffe to cauil and wrangle, though the same be true, as I tolde you before: but I allege S. Cyprian to this ende, that the Christiā Reader should beleue, that Christ is the Sacrifice. For so S. Cypriā precisely englished saith, *In the Sacrifice which Christ is*, whereof by right construction ryseth this Proposition, Christe is the Sacrifice. Which is true, though neuer so muche it be said by some Fathers, that the Pasion and Death of Christe is represented in a mysterie. both may stand together ful wel.

In this Mysterie there is a representation I graunt, there is a signification, there is a memorie or commemoration made of Christe, of his Pasiō, and of his Sacrifice

vpon

*In sacrificio, quod Christus est.*  
How, and where- with, is there made in our Mysteries a memorie and signification of Christe, and of his death.

upon the Crosse: but how, and where withal? Figuratiuely, by imagination, by thinking, by tokens and signes onely, or by wordes of praise and thanks onely? Not so. By these, and with these partly, but specially by offering and receiuing the same body, that suffered death.

So S. Augustine touching a memorie or commemoration, teacheth clearely writing against Faustus the Manichee. *Hebraei in victimis pecorum prophetiam celebrabāt*

August.

cōt. Faust.

lib. 20.

cap. 18.

*futura victimæ, quam Christus obtulit. Vnde iam Christiani per acti eiusdem Sacrificij memoriam celebrant sacrosanctâ oblatione, & participatione corporis & sanguinis Christi.*

The Hebrewes (saith he) in their sacrifices of beastes did celebrate a prophecie of the Sacrifice to come, which Christe offered. The Christians now doo delectate the memorie of the same Sacrifice that is past, by the most holy Oblation and participation of Christes body and bloude. Lo, here haue you the memorie: but withal the Oblation of that very body, whereby the memorie of his bloody Sacrifice is celebrated.

VVherin  
M. Iewell  
and they  
of that  
syde, are  
deceiued  
of igno-  
rāce, or  
of malice  
deceiue  
others.

You seme to be much deceiued in your thoughtes, in that you thinke, that a thing can not be exhibited really, and also in a mysterie, in a sampler, in an Image, in a commemoration, in a representation, in signification, in figures, signes, and tokens. And where so euer you finde in the writings of the Fathers any of these termes, thereof cōmonly you induce a Conclusion denying the truth of the thing: wherein either you are deceiued through ignorance (and then are you very sawcie to be so busy in teaching that you vnderstand not) or of very malice you trauaile al that you can to deceiue others, least you should seme to haue craked more in your Challenge,

lenge, then you are hable to mainteine.

Concerning the point it selfe, doo you not remember, that S. Paule doth attribute to the Law, *umbrā rerū*, the shadow of thinges, and to the newe Testament, *Imaginē rerum*, an Image of thinges? If of the affirmation of the Image, you wil inferre (as your manner is) the negation of the thing it selfe: shal you not so prepare a way for the heinous heresie of the Arians, who denyed the Sonne of God to be of one substance with God the Father? For though it be most true, that he is so, yet doth not the Scripture cal him *the Image of the inuisible God*? Hebr. 10.  
Image,  
excludeth  
not truth.  
  
Colos. 1.

Doth not S. Ambrose speaking of the bloody oblation of Christe vpon the Crosse, cal it an *Image*, in comparison of the true and euerlasting Oblation that is in heauen? *Hic umbra, hic Imago, illic veritas, & cetera.* Ambros. of  
fictorum li  
br. 1. c. 48. Here (saith he) that is to say, in this worlde, *there is a shadow, here there is an Image, there (in heauen) is the truth.* The shadow in the Law, the image in the Gospel, the truth in heauen. Before a lambe was offered, and a Calfe, now Christe is offered. But he is offered as man, as receiuing Passion, and he offereth him selfe as being a Priest to remit our synnes, here in Image, there in truth, where, with the Father as an Advocate, he maketh intercession for vs.

How say you Sir, if a man would folow the veine of your Logique, whereby you conclude the denial of a real and true Sacrifice in the Masse, bicause you can bring certaine peeces of Doctours sayinges reporting a representation, commemoration, and image of it: might he not of this place of S. Ambrose, denie, that Christe was euer offered vp and sacrificed vpon the Crosse tru-

SS

ly and



ly and in deede, bicause he saith, he was offered here in Image? And so should not the Deuil haue a pretty deuise to shake the foundation of our faith, and put the simple in doubte, whether the worke of our Redemption be yet truly performed or no?

That S. Cyprian saith, *the Sacrifice which we offer, is the Passion of our Lorde*, S. Augustine declareth how such sayings are to be vnderstanded. *Vocatur ipsa immolatio carnis quae sacerdotis manibus fit, Christi passio, mors, Crucifixio, non rei veritate, sed significante Mysterio.* The oblation (saith he) of Christes flesh which is made in the handes of a Priest, is called the Passion, Death, and crucifying of Christe, not in truth of the thing, but in a Mysterie signifying. Which is as much, as if he should say, it is not called passion, death and crucifying, for that Christ dieth or suffereth againe, but for that in mysterie it renueth, representeth, signifieth, and putteth vs in mynde againe of his Death and Passion.

Where S. Gregorie saith, after that he hath taken away al occasion of grosse imaginations, *that Christe who dyeth no more, but lyueth immortally in him selfe, dyeth againe in this Mysterie, and that his flesh suffereth againe for the peoples health*: it is the sooner vnderstanded, what he meaneth, if his *Antithesis* be considered, which consisteth in these wordes, *in seipso, & in hoc Mysterio, in him selfe, and in this Mysterie.* The like whereof we finde in S. Augustine before alleged, *Christe was once sacrificed in seipso, in him selfe, and yet he is daily sacrificed in sacramento, in a Sacrament.*

In him selfe, that is to say, in his visible person, and in the forme of man, he dyeth no more: yet in this Mysterie he dieth

August.  
libro sen  
tent.  
Prosperi.

How  
Christe.  
dieth  
again in  
this My  
sterie.  
De Con  
secrat.  
Distin. 2.  
Quid sit.  
August.  
Epist. 23.  
ad Boni  
facium.



he dieth againe, that is to say, his death is so for our behoofe by vs to the Father represented, and to vs renewed, and the vertue and effect of it is so applied, and transferred vnto vs: as if he were now presently hanging vpon the Crosse. *Hæc salutaris victima illam nobis mortem unigeniti per Mysterium reparat.* This healthful sacrifice doth renew vnto vs the Death of the only begotē by this Mysterie, saith S. Gregorie in the same place. doth any man aske; wherewithal, and whereby this is done? Verely as it is said before (touching the memorie) out of S. Augustine, *by the Oblation and participation of the same body,* that suffered and died vpon the Crosse. For though the paines and violēce of Death be not here presently suffered, yet the body that once suffered, is present, *and the bloude that was shed on the handes of infidels, is now shed into the mouthes of the faithful,* as S. Gregorie him selfe here saith. And to the working of such a death of Christe againe, and of his Pasion to our saluatiō in this Mysterie, that is to say, to the repairing and renewing, and applying of the effecte of his death vnto vs, that which is done in this Mysterie without violent shedding of bloude, is sufficient.

o This doctrine S. Gregorie teacheth in other places, wherby he both declareth the vertue of the Mystical Sacrifice, and also expoundeth him selfe, how that strange Phrase may be vnderstanded, which M. Iewel bringeth against the Real and true Sacrifice. Thus he saith in one place: *Hæc victima singulariter ab æterno interitu animam saluat, quæ illam nobis mortem unigeniti per Mysterium reparat.* This Sacrifice doth singularly saue the soule frō euerlasting destructiō, which by Mysterie reneweth vnto vs the.

De Consecrat.

Dist. 2.  
Quid sit.

Ibidem.

Gregor.

lib. 4.

Dialog.

cap. 58.

Idem  
bomil. 37.

Death of Gods onely begoten Sonne. Againe in an other place. *Quoties ei hostiam sua Passionis offerimus, toties nobis ad absolutionem nostram passionem illius reparamus.* As often as we offer vp vnto him the hoste (or sacrifice) of his Palsion, so often we renue and repaire his Palsion vnto vs for our absolution.

Vnblou-  
dy Death.

Now then bicause by this Sacrifice the Death of Christe is renued and applied vnto vs, for our absolution and remission of synne (which is the effecte of his Death) as if we had ben present at the Crosse, when he was crucified: therefore S. Gregorie was so bolde as to say, that Christe lyuing immortally in him selfe, in this Mysterie dyeth againe. Such Sacrifice, such Death. If the Sacrifice be bloody, then the Death must be bloody, or with shedding of bloude. If the Sacrifice be vnbloudy, then is the Death also vnbloudy, and mystical, that is to say, the effecte of his death, as if it were now present. And that there be truly and in proper speach a Sacrifice, it is ynough, that the body and bloude of Christe being made present by vertue of his worde, his Death be so applied vnto vs to remission of synne, as if he were now a dying.

And this muche may serue for Answer to the heape of your mangled and maimed allegations, that here you haue laid so thicke together. Whereof not one proueth your purpose, which is, that in S. Cyprians iudgement Christe in the celebration of the Supper, is not a Sacrifice in true and proper speache and in deede, but by a figuratiue speache onely, as it is said, *the rocke was Christe*. For though the Fathers vse sometimes figuratine speeches, yet thereof it foloweth not,

not, that S. Cyprian in this place of his Epistle to Cecilius spake figuratiuely, in saying, that Christe is the Sacrifice.

That he spake truly, and meant according to the proprietic of the speech, it is cleare by his owne wordes in the same Epistle. For els hauing mencioned the Sacrifice of Melchisedech, which consisted of bread and wine, he would neuer haue said these wordes, *Quam rem perficiens & adimplens Dominus panem & calicem mixtum vino obtulit, & qui est plenitudo, veritatem praefiguratae Imaginis adimplenit.* Our Lorde offered bread and cuppe mixte with wine perfiting and fulfilling the thing that Melchisedech did, and he that is the fulnes, fulfilled the truth of the forefigured Image. Now if Christe at his Supper (for thereof S. Cyprian speaketh) offered not a true Sacrifice of his body and bloude in deede, and therefore a true and real Sacrifice, vnder the formes of bread and wine, but onely a signe and figure, or an Image representing his body and bloude: How then was he the fulnesse? How did he fulfil the truth of the forefigured Image? For if al were but a signe and token, memorie, or representation, that he offered, then was not he the fulnesse, neither fulfilled the truth. For signes, if they be onely signes, be empty and void of the truth, neither is fulnesse, but where the very thinges be present. And by such interpretation, S. Cyprian should make the Sacrifice of Christe at his Supper, no better then that of Melchisedech was, and, which is absurde, the truth of a forefigured image should be but a figure, and fulnesse should be voide of the thing fulfilled.

Cyprian.  
ad Cecil.  
lib. 2. epi-  
stola 3.

Christe at  
his supper  
fulfilled  
the figure  
of Mel-  
chisedek.

Fulnes of  
personae  
inance.

M. Iewell  
āfvrereth  
as he thin-  
keth good  
to a word  
or two,  
ād leaueth  
the chiefe  
substance  
vnafvrereth  
red.

How be it to proue the Sacrifice by witnesse of S. Cyprian, I stayed not my selfe vpon these wordes, *In Sacrificio quod Christus est*, specially: but vpon the large processe of that whole Epistle. Whereof I tooke what seemed to make good proufe of that I intended. And I pray you Sir, why answer you not to the other manifest wordes? What Sacrifice is that, which, as S. Cyprian saith, *Christe first of al offered vp vnto his Father, and cōmaunded the same to be offered in his remembrance?* What Sacrifice is that, *in doing whereof the Priest doth the office of Christe truly?* What Sacrifice is that, *in offering vp whereof the Priest doth by imitation, the same thing that Christe did?* What is that true and persite Sacrifice, *that he offreth vp to God, if he beginne to offer right so, as he seeth Christe him selfe to haue offered?* If you could haue named vs any other, besides the Sacrifice of the body and bloud of Christe, is it to be thought you would haue concealed it to so great hinderance of your cause? That whereby your Challenge is fully answered, and the Catholique Doctrine plainely auouched, you ouerhippe and dissemble: and vpon a peece of a sentence by your selfe falsified, and by your wrong translation wreathed from S. Cyprians meaning, you bestowe many woordes, and much of your common stuffe, which consisteth of your Phrases, pyked out of your Norebookes, and here without trueth or iudgement shuffled together

Jewel.

And that the vweaknes of M. Hardinges gheasses may the better appeare, vnderstande thou good Christian Reader, that the Holy Catholique

like Fathers haue used to say, that Christe is Sacrificed, not only in the Holy Supper, but also in the Sacrament of Baptisme. S. Augustine saith, *August. in expositiōe inchoata ad Rom.* Holocaustum Dominicæ Passionis eo tempore pro se quisque offert, quo eiusdem Passionis Fide dedicatur: The Sacrifice of our Lordes Passion euery man then offereth for him selfe, when he is Confirmed in the Faith of his Passion. And againe, Holocaustum Domini tunc pro vnoquoque offertur quodammodo, *In eod. li.* cum eius nomine Baptizando signatur: Then is the Sacrifice of our Lorde In a Manner offered for eche man, when in Baptisme he is marked with the name of Christe. And againe, Non relinquatur Sacrificium pro peccatis: id est, non potest denuo Baptizari: There is leaste no Sacrifice for Sinne: that is to say, He can be no more Baptized. And in this consideration Chrysostome saith, *Chrysost. in epist. ad Hebraeos hom. 16. Ambros. de penit. li. 2. ca. 2.* Baptisma Christi Sanguis Christi est: Christes Baptisme, is Christes Bloude. And likewise S. Ambrose, In Baptismo Crucifigimus in nobis Filium Dei: In Baptisme wee Crucifie in our selues the Sonne of God.

Harding.

Concerning the Sacrifice made in Baptisme, where- *August. in* of you tel vs out of the Auncient Fathers, That euery *expositiōe* one at that time for his synnes offereth vp the Burnt sa- *inchoata* crifice of our Lordes Passion, When in the faith of the *in epistol-* same Passion he is dedicated, as S. Augustine saith: *ad Rom.* and that in Baptisme we crucifie in vs the Sonne of God, as S. Ambrose saith: by their owne woordes *Ambros. de penit. li. 2. ca. 2.* they teache vs to vnderstande this spiritually, and not as the woordes founde in proper speache. For S. Augustine in that place qualifieth the manner of his vtterance, and calleth his reader backe from absurde imagination, by this worde *quodammodo*, as much to say, *Quodam-* in a manner: And S. Ambrose likewise saith not simply, *modo.* that



that in Baptisme we crucifie Christe, but that we crucifie him in vs. *Crucifigimus in nobis Filium Dei*, *We crucifie in vs the Sonne of God*, saith he. Whereby they meane, that in Baptisme we put on Christe, that to sinne we die with Christe, and are buried with him into death, and are made conformable to the similitude of his death, and that the effecte, vertue, and benefite of his Passion, by Baptisme is applyed vnto vs. And bicause as Moyse sprinckled with bloude the booke of the Olde Testament, the Tabernacle, and the Vessels of Ministerie, right so Christe with his owne Bloude cleanseth our myndes, which be the bookes of the Newe Testament by interpretation of S. Chrysostome, and with the same bloude sprinckleth vs, who are his Tabernacle for him to dwel in, and to walke in, as he saith him selfe, and his Vessels to serue him in holy Ministeries, which great benefite is chiefly deriued vnto vs in Baptisme: In consideration hereof, forasmuch as vpon the Crosse onely his pretious blood ranne out of his body, and then was he in him selfe sacrificed: these Fathers feared not to say, \* the one, that *in Baptisme we crucifie in vs the Sonne of God*, \* the other, that *when we are baptized, we offer vp the Burnt sacrifice of his Passion.* 2

To conclude then, if certaine Fathers in a figuratiue speache, and with a qualification say, that when one is baptized, he offereth vp the Sacrifice of Christes Passion, or that in him selfe he crucifieth Christe, which is true in a right sense: M. Jewel may not thereof conclude, that Christe at the celebration of the Supper is not truly offered. For if he reason thus, Christe is after a manner offered of vs, when we are baptized, *Ergo*, he is

Leuit. 4.

Hebr. 9.

Chrysosto.

in epist. ad

Hebraeos.

Homi. 16.

\* Ambros.

\* August.

he is not offered of the Priest in the Sacrament of the Altar. Forasmuch as in Baptisme he is onely by grace, and in the blessed Sacrament really, and in substance: E-  
 uery man of meane vnderstanding may soone espy the fondnesse of the Argument. But not being hable directly to impugne this assured truth, he maketh such a proffer towards it as he can, by setting one truth against an other truth.

M. Iewvel  
 setteth  
 one truth  
 against an  
 other.

The .ii. Diuision.

The Answer.

**O**V R aduersaries crake much of the sealing vp of their newe Doctrine with the Bloud of such and such, who be written in the booke of lyes, not in the booke of life, whome they wil needes to be called Martyrs. Verily if those Mounkes, and Friers, Apostates, and renegates, wedded to wines, or rather (to vse their owne terme) yoked to Sisters, be true Martyrs: then must our Newe Gospellers pul these Holy Fathers, and many Thousandes moe out of Heauen. For certainly the Faith, in Defence of whiche either sorte died, is vtterly contrary. The worst that I wishe to them is, that God geue them eyes to see, and eares to heare, and that he shutte not vp their hartes, so as they see not the light here, vntil they be throwen away into the outward darkenes, where shalbe weeping and gruntinge of teeth.

Math. 23.

Iewel.

*1. Cor. 9.* This talke was vterly out of season: sauing that it liked wel M. Harding, to spurre him selfe with the Scriptures of God, and a litle to scosse at the wordes of S. Paule. Which thing becomming him so wel, may be the *Philp. 4.* better borne withal, when it shal please him likewise to scosse at others. *Heb. 13.* S. Paule calleth viues, sometimes Sisters, sometimes Yokefellows: and thinketh Matrimonic to be Honorable in al Personnes: and the forbidding of the same to be the Doctrine of Diuels. Neither doth it any way appeare, that euer honest godly Matrimonic either displeased God, or was thought vncomely for a Martyr, and witnesse of Gods Truth.

Harding.

Here M. Iewel you leaue my Conclusion, and being grieved with certaine termes, you shew your selfe much offended, and fare as if your soare were touched in the quicke. But sir, what neede you of al the Gospellers, to take this mater so hote? You are not yet married pardye. Marye if perhaps your fanisie lye to a woman, and you determine to take her to your wife, wel mote you doo, God send you good lucke, I intende not to forbyd your Banes.

M Iewell  
here dis-  
gresseth  
from the  
purpose  
into a cō-  
mō place,  
to defend  
Priestes  
Mariages

But what meant you in this place to vnlade your common stufte, that you haue gathered together in defence of Priestes marriage? What iust occasion had you to treat thereof? What, feared you that the bulke of your booke would not arise huge ynough, vnlesse you brought vnto it such heapes of vnnecessary common places? Or thought you rather, that your companions marriages should be taken, as they be in deede, for detestable horedome, and abominable Inceste, except they were by you defended? Or brought you in al this vnreasonable talke, only to please your felowes the Apostates,  
and

and their strompets? Verily the terme, *yoked to Sisters*, which is a badge of your owne liuerie, vsed by me as it were by the way, speaking of an other mater, ministred not sufficient occasion to enter into so large a discourse in defence of your filthy yokings.

Why did you not rather reprocue me for calling the Registre of your stincking Martyrs, the booke of lyes? Why did you not proue your Lecherours married Monkes, and Friers, the chiefe Apostles of your Synagogue, not to be Apostates? Why answered you not the point, that if they be true Martyrs, then must you pul those holy Fathers, whom I alleged for the Sacrifice, out of heauen? For both can not be placed there, the faith in defence whereof either sorte dyed, being quite contrary. This parte of my talke was not al together out of ceason.

And wherein I pray you do I sporte with the Scriptures, and scoffe at the woordes of S. Paule, for there-with you burthen me. What, bicause hauing said of your Monkes, and Friers, that they were wedded to wiues I corrected my terme, saying rather (to vse your owne manner of speech) that they were yoked to sisters, is this sporting with the Scriptures of God? Is this scoffing at S. Pauls wordes? You should first haue proued your Apostates strompettes to be their lawful wiues, and then might you better haue framed an obiection against me. Now that practise being contrary to the Scripture, which commaundeth vowes to be kepte and performed, what Scripture haue ye for such yoking? What reliefe haue ye for it of S. Paule? Psal. 75.

Though in dede faithful and godly wiues be together

T T ij                      with

with vs that beleue, the children of God, and in the primitive Church the name of Brother and Sister was common among the beleuers, yet how prooue you, that S. Paule calleth wyues, sometimes Sisters, sometimes yoke-fellowes? Is it not shame for you, who professe so great skil in the Latine tongue, and haue such a helper at hand for the Greeke tongue, to grounde your selfe vpon the corrupte translation of your English Bible?

Were it true that S. Paule called wytes sometimes Sisters, sometimes Yokefellowes, for which ye haue nothing to allege, but the English Bibles translation: yet how are ye hable to prooue the yoking that is betwene your blessed Brothers and Sisters, that is to say, betwen your holy Prelates, Priests, Monkes, Friars and Nonnes, who haue bounde them selues by solemne vowe to the contrary, to be true wedloke?

By you quotation you appoint your Reader to the. 9. Chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians. What is there, that maketh for you? S. Paule saith, *Haue not we power to leade about a sister woman with vs, as the other Apostles, and the brethren of our Lorde, and Cephas?*

What meaneth he by ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα, *sororem mulierem*, a Sister woman, but a faithful or a Christian woman?

For as the men that beleued were called Brothers, so the women were called Sisters. As for your Translatour, who turneth it, *a Sister to Wife*, whether for the Greeke he haue deliuered true English or no, let other iudge, certainly he hath deliuered vs a false sense. For, as S. Ambrose, S. Augustine, the Greeke Scholies, and Theophylacte, and specially S. Hierome do expounde the place, S. Paule meaneth not, that the Apostles caried their

owne

What  
meant S.  
Paule by  
A sister  
woman.  
1. Cor. 9.  
August. li.  
de opere  
Monacho-  
vii. cap. 4.  
Ambro. in  
Commen.  
Theophyl.  
in Comen.  
Hier. cō-  
tra Iovin.  
lib. 1.



owne wiues about with them, where so euer they preached : but that certaine deuoute faithful wemen, hauing wordly substance , desyrous to heare our Lordes doctrine , and to leade a holy life , went about with them, and ministred vnto them both sustenance of their goods, and also necessary seruices, that they should haue care of nothing , but onely attend the worke of preaching. Wherein the Apostles folowed the example of Christe. For likewise when he went about and preached, certaine holy wemen went with him from Galiley , who of their goods ministred vnto him what was necessary, namely Marie Maudelen, Ioan wife to Chusa Herods stewarde, Sufanna, and many others. This S. Paule saith was lawfull for him to doo being an Apostle, as the other Apostles did , but yet he telleth that he would not vse that libertie.

Luc. 8.

*Some not understanding this saith Augustine (of whom M. Iewel seemeth to be one, if it be not malice of his parte, and not only ignorance) for Sororem mulierem, a Sister woman, haue interpreted sororem uxorem, a sister wife, or, as the English Translation hath, a Sister to Wife. The ambiguitie of the Greeke worde hath deceined them (saith he) because in Greeke a wife, and a woman, is named by one worde. Lo M. Iewel here is your wife that S. Paule speaketh of, become, not a wife precisely, but a woman, and the same a Sister, not in respecte of nearenesse of bloude, but of faith, for that she is a Christian.*

August. li.  
de opere  
Monache.

γυνή.

By this we learne, what credit is to be geuen vnto the chiefe Maisters of this newe Gospel in the time of King Edward the sixth, who in the newe Testamente persecuted ( as in the same booke we finde) by the commaunde-

Printed  
by Ri-  
chard  
Iugge.

mēt of the King and the Coūcel, and by them auſtorized, vpon this place of S. Paule haue at the ende of the Chapter put in this Note. *By this ſaying of S. Paule we haue a full inſtruction, that the Apoſtles did carye about their wines with them.* By this Note, we haue a full inſtruction, that the Tranſlatours of the Bible, and the makers of ſuch Notes, were falſe hartlots.

Philip. 4. As for the Yokeſelow, to whom S. Paule in the Epiſtle to the Philippians commendeth the women that laboured with him in the Goſpel, that thereby is ſignified S. Pauls wife, beſides that ye haue neither reaſon for it, nor the proprietie of the Greeke tongue clearly bearing it: it is gaineſaid by S. Chryſoſtom, Theophylacte, and the Author of the Greeke Scholies in the ſame place, and by S. Ambroſe, and S. Hierom, and *Epiphanius* otherwheres, who deny vtterly, that he had a wife. The author of the briefe commentaries vpon S. Pauls Epiſtles printed with *Epiphanius* S. Hieromes workes, is of the opinion; that this Yokeſelow, to whom S. Paule ſpeaketh, was a man, named *Germanus* in Latine, which in Greeke is *Γερμανός*. and the Greeke Scholiaſt iudgeth (which S. Chryſoſtom alſo noteth) that his name was *Syzgyus*, in Greeke, that *Lyra* be not altogether lawghed to ſcorne, for thinking that his name was *Compar* in Latine.

Philip. 4.

σὺζυγὴ

γυναικὸς

Germane

Compar.

Ambro. in

2. Cor. 11.

Hiero. cō-

tra Iouin.

Epiphan.

heresi. 58.

Chryſo. in

Commen.

Σύζυγος.

Compar.

Whereas then theſe auncient learned Fathers liked not the interpretation of certaine before their time, that thought S. Paule in that Epiſtle to ſpeake to his wife, vpon good warrant of their conſtruction we may be bold to tel M. Iewel, and M. Erasmus, whom alwaies it liked wel vpon the leaſt occaſion that was offred him, to ſwarue from the receiued expoſition of the Scriptures: that

that in the said place S. Paule spake to no Yokefelow woman, but to a Yokefelow man, and that they are deceived in expounding it of S. Pauls wife, who by euident likelihod gathered of his owne wordes, and by iudgemēt of al the olde Fathers in manner, ( Clement of Alexandria excepte) neuer had wife.

Yokefelow man.

1. Cor. 7.

Seing therefore Monkes, Friers and Priestes that be wyued, can not truly cal their wemen wyues, being in dede no wiues, but strompetes: they do wisely ( according to the wisdom of such a generation ) to put vpon so filthy a thing, the cleane name of a Sister, or of a Yokefelow, that whereas the mariage it selfe is naught, yea detestable Sacrilege, and therefore of right they them selues should be called sacrilegious aduoutrers, and their wemen sacrilegious harlots: yet by allurement of an honest name wemen might be content to yoke with them, which, if they were called by their true names, would neuer be induced to be made instrumentes of so open abomination.

The wisdom of the vviued Apostates.

And where S. Paule saith of matrimonie ( as you report him ) that *it is honorable, in al personnes*, he meaneth not absolutely al ( for your selfe I trowe wil except it betwene Father and daughter, brother and sister, and such as haue impediments of nature ) but only those persons, for whom it is lawful, cōuenient, and godly to marrye. The case of a solēne vow maketh matrimonie otherwise lawful and honorable of it selfe, to those that haue made such vow to the cōtrary, vnlawful and reprocheful. Neither may we think alwaies none to be excluded, wher the Scripture in terme includeth al. For though it say, that Christ doth illuminat (*omne hominē venientē in hūc mūdū*)

Heb. 13. This vvorde, Al, many times in Scripture admits teth exceptiō of many.

Ioan. 1.

euery

1. Tim. 2.

1. Ion. 10.

Matth. 20.

euery man that commeth into this worlde, and that God wil (*omnes homines saluos fieri*) al men to be sauēd, and though Christ say in the Gospel, *al, euen as many, as came afore me are theues and robbers*: yet certaine it is, that many remaine in darkenes, and that (many being called and fewe chosen) mo shal be damned then sauēd, and that the Patriarkes, Moyſes, and the Prophetes, who came afore Christe was incarnate, were Gods true frendes, and faithful seruantes.

S. Paules  
vvordes  
deuoly  
exami  
ned, make  
not mari  
age law  
ful for al  
vvithout  
exceptiō.

Heb. 13.

Furthermore touching this place of S. Paule by them of your secte so commonly alleged in defence of Priestes Mariages, what haue you to answer, if it be denyed, the blessed Apostle to say, as you report him? The best learned Fathers, who haue expounded that Epistle, iudge that saying to be an exhortation to persons already married, that they kepe their wedlocke in chastitie and honestie, and desyle not their wedlocke bedde with vnworthy wantonnesse. And so after their iudgement, for asmuch as the verbe *est, is*, is not in S. Paule, neither in the Greeke, nor in the Latine (for his saying is, *honorable in omnibus*) and the circumstance of the place so beareth it, in which diuerſe thinges be vttered by way of exhortation: the saying is not to be pronounced indicatiuely, but exhortatiuely, *Let wedlocke be honorable in al* (married persons) *and* (let) *their bedde be undefiled*. Thus it is made cleare, how litle reliefe S. Paule by this sentence bringeth to the defence of your sacrilegious Apostates incestuous and abominable yokinges. beare with your owne terme, for Matrimonie, or wedlocke it is not, neither is the same a conuenient terme for such filth.

But

But S. Paule say you, calleth the forbidding of 1. Tim. 4. Matrimonie the doctrine of Diuels. I answer. To forbid Matrimonie in general, and to condemne marriage in al persons, of what estate or degree so euer they be, as Tatianus the Heretique did, and the Eucratites that folowed him, who said that Mariages were of the Diuel, and were no better then fornications, and therefore admitted none to their Communion that were married, men or wemen: this is the doctrine of Diuels. Of these, and such others, as the Manichees and Marcionites, S. Paule is to be vnderstanded. To forbyd the Mariages of Votaries, as Monkes, Friers, Priestes and Nonnes, who by solemne vowe for Gods sake haue bereued them selues of the common libertie: this is not the doctrine of Diuels, but of God, and the permitting of Mariage to such persons, is the doctrine of Beelzebub the Prince of Diuels.

In vvhat  
sense S.  
Paule cal-  
leth the  
forbiddig  
of Mari-  
age, the  
doctrine  
of Devils.

Lastely, if no man euer sayd, that honest and godly Matrimonie displeased God, if the same were neuer thought vncomely for a Martyr, whome charge you with that odious saying? As certaine it is, that many a good married man and woman is a holy Saint in heauen: so ye wil neuer be hable to shewe vs, that your yoking of Votaries vnto such as ye cal Sisters, was euer in Christes Church accompted for godly or honest Matrimonie, or that a Vowebreaker was euer taken before God, or good man, for a comely Martyr, or witnessse of Gods truth, onlesse hauing loosed him selfe from his vnlaufull yokefellow, he repented truely of his synne, and so by penance were restored vnto the state of grace.

V V

Iewel.



Ignat. ad S. Paule vvas Married, as it appeareth by Ignatius, Clemens, Eusebi-  
Philadelp. us : and yet neuerthelesse vvas a martyr. S. Peter, the chiefe of the Apostles  
Euseb. lib. had a vvife : and yet neuerthelesse stode by, and gaue her comfotte, and  
3. cap. 30. constancie at her Martyrdome. The tvvelue Apostles, saith S. Ambrose,  
Clemens onely S. Iohn excepted, vv ere al married: and yet neuerthelesse, the  
Stromat. same S. Iohn onely excepted, as it is thought, vv ere al Martyrs.  
lib. 7. Spiridion vvas a married Bishop: and yet as Sozomenus vvriteth,  
Euseb. li. 3. he vv as thereby nothing hindered, neither to discharge his duetie,  
cap. 30. nor to any other godly purpose. Tertullian vvas a Priest, as appea-  
Ambros. reth by S. Hierome : and Married, as appeareth by his ovne Booke  
in 2. ad vvritten to his VVife : and yet notvvithstanding, as some reporte, vvas  
Cor. ca. 11. a Martyr. S. Hilarie vvas a Reuerende Father, and Bishop of Poi-  
Sozomen. tiers, and yet Married, as may be gathered by his Epistle vvritten to  
lib. 1. ca. 11 his daughter Abra.

Ad res di-  
uinas ne-  
bilo dese-  
rior.

Harding.

vv whether  
S. Paule  
were mar-  
ried.

1. Cor. 7.

Ibidem.

Epiphan.  
cōtra Va-  
lesios hare  
si, 58.

Softe M. Jewel, doubteful pointes, flatte lyes, and  
true tales, must not be so shuffled together. First tou-  
ching S. Paule, that he was a Martyr, true it is, but that  
he was married, if it be not vtterly false, yet it is very  
vncertaine, and more then vnlikely. Very probable it  
is, that he was not married: for so to thinke of him,  
his owne wordes doo leade vs, where he saith, *Volo*  
*omnes homines esse sicut meipsum*. My wil is, that al men  
were, as I am my selfe. And againe, *I say vnto the vn-*  
*married, and vnto the widowes, it is good for them, if they*  
*continue so as I doo*. Of these later wordes, how can  
you make any literal sence probable, except S. Paule ab-  
steined from marriage, or els were a wydower? Truly  
*Epiphanius* allegeth them for proufe that S. Paule was a  
Virgin.

It is

It is cleare by S. Ambrose, that he was neuer married. For thus he saith, speaking to virgins, and exhorting them to the continencie of S. Paule: *Volo vos imitatrices esse tanti Apostoli, ut vitam eius sequamini, qui coniugij vinculum refugit, ut vinctus esset Christi Iesu.* Ambros. in exhortati- one ad vir- gines.

*Non potuisset ad tantam Apostolatus sui peruenire gratiam, si fuisset alligatus coniugij contubernio.* I wil you to be the folowers of so great an Apostle, that ye folow his life, who eschewed the band of wedlocke, that he might be the bounde prisoner of Christe Iesus. He could not haue come vnto so great grace of his Apostleship, if he had ben tyed vnto the felowship of wedlocke.

S. Augustine semeth to be of the same opinion, *August. de whose woordes these be. Doctor Gentium & pudicitiam gratia & coniugalem, per quam non sunt adulteria, & perfectiore cō-* lib. arbit.  
*tinentiam, per quam nullus concubitus queritur, sermone suo* cap. 4.  
*commendans, & hoc donum Dei esse monstrat, scribens ad Corinthios & admonens coniuges, ne se inuicem fraudulent:* 1. Cor. 7.  
*quos cum admonuisset, adiecit. Vellem autem omnes homines esse sicut me ipsum: quia utique ipse ab omni concubitu contin-*  
*ebat.* S. Paule, the Doctōr of the Gentiles cōmending with his worde both the chastitie of wedlocke, through whiche aduoutries be not done, and the perfiter continencie by whiche no carnal acte is sought, sheweth this also to be the gifte of God writing to the Corinthians, and admonishing married persons, that they withdrawe not dewtie the one from the other. And hauing admonished them, he saith further: but I would faine al men were as I my selfe am: bicause certainly he abstained from al carnal acte. Vide Augu- stin. in lib. De bono cō- iug. ca. 10.

S. Ambrose in an other place acknowlegeth S. Paules

V V ij

virgini-

*Ambros. de virgin. lib. 3. ad finē.*

virginitie, saying thus vnto Virgins. *Vniſciet vos Paulus qui vos praecepit honorari, qui ait: bonum est si sic maneat sicut & ego. honore prouocat, magisterio docet, inuitat ex emplo.* Let Paule quicken you, who commaunded you to be honoured, who saith: It is good, if they continue so as I doo. He stirreth you (thereto) with honour, he teacheth with his doctorship, he inuiteth you by his example.

What shal we say then to S. Ignatius, Eusebius, and Clemens Alexandrinus, by whom it appeareth that S. Paule was married? S. Ignatius is corrupted by them that would al votaries and religious persons to marie. For the olde written copies haue not S. Pauls name in the Epistle *ad Philadelphiensis*, which for that purpose is alleged. For sufficiēt credite hereof I report me to the ancient copies, that be in sundry places, and specially to that of Maudelen Colleges librarie in Oxford in my time. much vewed of learned men for trial of the same point.

Euseb.  
hist. Ec-  
cles. lib. 3.  
cap. 30.

As for Eusebius, he doth but recite the wordes of Clemens. that he so thought him selfe of S. Paule, it doth not any way appeare. Onely then Clemens remaineth of al the Antiquitie, that saith S. Paule had a wife. And the same he gathereth of the vncertaine place that is in the Epistle to the Philippians, *rogo te germane compar*, where the Greke hath *συνοῦσε ἑμίονε*: and of the 9. chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, wherein he is not allowed of the best learned Fathers.

Epiphan:  
contra Va-  
lesios. Ha-  
res. 58.

If this mater should be weighed by the auctoritie of the Fathers, how shal Clemens alone stand in balance against S. Chrysostom, Epiphanius, S. Ambrose, S. Hierome, S. Augustine, and Theophilacte, which al except  
Epipha-

Epiphanius and Theophylact, by verdite of your owne great Rabbi Peter Martyr him selfe, be touching this point contrary to Clemens? S. Hierome saith, *Non sunt audiendi, qui cum uxorem habuisse consingunt*. They are not to be heard, which seine of their owne head, that S. Paule had a wife. Theophylacte is not a feard to say, those which said that S. Paule exhorted his wife, when he wrote those wordes, *I beseeche thee also my faithful yoke-fellowe &c.* to be deceiued. his wordes be these. *Some who be deceiued, saye, that Paule exhorteth his wife. But it is farre otherwise.* S. Chrysostom vpon the same place, saith much like.

That S. Peter (whom you cal the Chiefe of the Apostles, whereat I maruel) had ones a wife, it is cleare by the Scripture, in which mention is made of his mother in lawe. But that you reporte of S. Ambrose, that he should say, *that the twelue Apostles, onely S. Iohn excepted, were al married,* it is a flatte and an impudēt lye. Whether it be a lye or no, let the booke be a trial. S. Ambroses very wordes be these. *Omnes Apostoli exceptis Ioanne & Paulo uxores habuerūt.* What is that in plaine english, but this, *Al the Apostles had wiues except Iohn and Paule?* Is it one thing M. Iewel to say, onely Iohn excepted, and except Iohn and Paule? S. Pauls name you thought best to nippe away, least you should destroy that you builded vp a litle before out of Clemens.

But although S. Peter, and other Apostles had once wiues, yet S. Hierome of the Scripture gathereth, that after they were called to Apostleship, they forsooke the companie of their wiues, and lyued the single life. Thus he saith, *Petrus & ceteri Apostoli, &c. Peter and the other*

VV ij

Apostles

Pet. Martyr in Cō-  
ment. in 1.

Epist. ad  
Cor. cap. 9

Hieron.  
ad Eust.

de Virg.  
Theophi-

lact. in  
Epist. ad

Philip.  
cap. 4.

A flatte  
and an

impudēt  
lye of M.

Iewels.  
Luca. 4.

Hieron.  
cōtra Ioa-

uin. lib. 1.



*Apostles had wives I graunte : but suche, as they had taken at that time, when they knewe not the Gospel. Afterward being assumed unto the Apostleship, they leaſte the office of wedlocke. For whereas Peter ſaid to our Lorde in the*  
*Math. 19.* *person of the Apostles, Beholde, We forſake al thinges, and have folowed thee: our Lorde answered him: Verely I ſay unto you, that there is no man that hath forſaken, howſe, Father and Mother, or brothers, or wife, or children, for the kingdom of heauens ſake, but he ſhal receiue muche more in this worlde, and in the world to come liſe euerlaſting. It appeareth by the answer of our Lorde, that S. Peter ſaying, he, and the reſt of the Apostles had forſaken al thinges, meant that they had forſaken, and geuen ouer the companie of their wiues. Whiche maketh altogether againſt M. Jewels carnal Doctrin, vttered here in fauour of his fleſhly companions, our Apoſtates, the chiefe Prelates of their new Synagogue. S. Auguſtine ſaith, that the Apostles made this vowe, to forſake wiues and altogether. *Hoc votum potentiſſimi vouerant.* They mightieſt of al ( ſo there he calleth the Apostles) had vowed this vowe.*

*Auguſt. de ciuita. Dei li. 17. c. 4.*

*Spiridion.* Spiridion was a married Biſhop, that is to ſay, made a Biſhop after that he had ben married, but neither he, nor any els was euer lawfully married after that he had ben Biſhop or Prieſt. That he was thereby made neuer the worſe touching gods ſeruice (ſo ſaith Sozomenus of him) it is reported for a ſtraunge thing. As though a Biſhop to haue a wife and children, (as of Spiridion it is written) and yet to doo his dutie to Godwarde neuertheleſſe, it were in manner to be holden for a miracle, or at leaſt for a ſpecial grace of God.

*Sozomeno li. 1. c. 11.*

How



How be it I trow, if Sozomenus wordes be exactly construed, they shal not seme so muche to importe, that Spiridion was a married Bishop, which you say of him, as that he had ben a married man, and had once had wife and children. For the Greke worde is ἐξέτερος, whereby may be signified indeterminately, that he had ben, and not onely that he was so, being a Bishop. That he had his wife lyuing, when he was a Bishop, sure I am Sozomenus saith it not. And though he said it, yet maketh it nothing for your mariage of Priestes, and votaries. He saith that Spiridion had ben a man that <sup>\*ἀποικος</sup> lyued by husbandry, hauing wife and children. Now as wisemen thinke not, that he continued his tillage of grownde, and feeding of catail, after that he was called to be Bishop of Trimythus a Citie of Cyprus, but that he came into the Citie, and there attended his spiritual charge in tilling and feeding soules committed to his gouernement: so there is nothing spoken by Sozomenus, that forceth this opinion, that he had his wife being Bishop. Which being so, it was more boldely, then assuredly by learning of you said, that *Spiridion was a married Bishop.*

By this place of Sozomenus you may as wel proue, that ploughmen and shepheards may be Bishops (wherein I wil not greatly strue with you, if you commend vnto vs such as Spiridion was) or that Bishops may be ploughmen and shepherds: as that Bishops may be married men. Yet I wish ye would not forgete, that we denye not, but that in the Primitiue Church Married men were made Bishops: but that euer in the Catholike Church any man, after he was made Bishop, was married, that doo we vtterly denye.

And

And whereas Sozomenus saith of Spiridion by way of correction, *tame ad res diuinas nihilo deteriorerat*, and yet for al that he was neuer a whit the worse disposed toward the seruice of God, which you haue noted: the same may be spoken as wel in respect that he was a man that exercised Husbādry, as that he was married. For both the toile of Husbandry, and the care of wife and children, and specially both these together, be some lettes to the quiet libertie of Gods seruice. So that of Sozomenus by you alleged ye gete no certaine reliefe at al. This very place you bring for Priestes mariages in your Apologie, if it be yours. What I haue answered vnto it: the Reader may see in my Confutation of the same.

Fol. 77.

**Tertullia** As for Tertullian, that he had a wife, and was a Priest, as no man denieth, so it helpeth nothing toward the defence of your Vowebreakers incestuous mariages.

One auncient example of a Priest lawfully married after holy orders taken, had relieued your cause more, then al this number of married Apostles, Bishops, and Priestes.

If ye can finde none such, as we knowe ye can not: bewray not the weakenes of your cause by oft telling vs of that al the world knoweth, and your selfe see, it serued not your turne. That your Doctor Regino maketh

**Tertullia**  
no Mart  
tyr.

**Rhenan. in**

**vita Tert.**

**M. leuvel**

is very

sawvy

vvith S.

Hilare, ap

pointing

him a vvi

fe, vvhere

as he had

neuer co.

ne,

him a Martyr, he tooke more vpon him, then he was habble to iustifie. Had he ben a Martyr, S. Hierome, who fauoured him so greatly, writing his life would not haue omitted it. Therefore *Beatus Rhenanus* beleueth it not, and thinketh the Martyr was an other man of that name.

But I maruel how you durst be so sawty with, that reuered Father, and costant Bishop S. Hilarie, as to appoint him a wife, and to place him in the rancke of Married Priestes.

Priestles. Can not your filthy yoking of Votaries be defended, but with filthy lying? Wath learned man euer said or wrote, that S. Hilarie had a wife? Touching the foolish Epistle that you allege written to Abra his daughter, had ye not bene very needy of good stufte, and imprudent in facing out a bad mater: ye would neuer for shame haue mentioned such a fonde forged writing. Neither can you plead ignorance for your excuse. For; that no man should be deceiued with the Inscription of the Epistle, hath not Erasmus there geuen a plaine warning of it? *Hac Epistola metum est nungamentum hominis ociosè indocti?* What is this to say, but, *This Epistle is a tale of a tubbe written by some daw that wist not how to spende his time?* And now a Gods name it must be alleged in great sadnesse by this worthy Superintendēt, to make good the abominable marriages of Priestles, Monkes, Friers, and Nonnes. As wel he might haue alleged for them the booke of Beuys of Southamptō, or of Guy of Warwike, or the Song of Robin Hoode. But thanks be to God, who reueleth to the worlde, with what ragges they couer their vncleane trechery.

The forged Epistle of S. Hilarie to Abra his daughter.

Inter opera Hilarij

Iewel.

And to leaue infinite others, S. Chrysostome saith, Ita pretiosa res est Matrimonium, vt possis cum eo ad Sanctum Episcopatus Solium subuehi. Vtere moderatè nuptijs, & eris primus in Regno Cœlorum. So precious a thinge is matrimonie, that with the same thou maist be promoted euen vnto the Bishoppes Chaire. Vse Mariage with discretion, and thou shalt be the Chiefe in the Kingdome of Heauen. S. Hierome saith, Hodiè quoque plu-

Chrysost. in epist. ad Tit. Homi. 2.

In epist. ad Hebr. Homi. 7.

XX

rim

rimi Sacerdotes habent Matrimonia: Euen nowe a greate number of Priestles liue in Matrimonie. Thus the Apostles of Christe, Hierony. and many other Learned Fathers, and godly Bishopes were married, contra lo- and, as M. Hardinge saith, in his mirth, and pleasure, had their uisitation. Sisters, and yoke fellowes. But howe, and with what Sisters, or Fellowes, a greate number of the Vniuerselle sorte of M. Hardinges side be yoked, for very regarde of honestie, it may not be vitered.

Harding.

Say not M. Iewel, to leaue infinite others. Your ambition is such, and your cause so weake, that if ye had others, ye would not be so squeamish to bring them forth. Now these two will helpe your neede nothing at al. S. Chrysostome vpon the saying of S. Paule to Tite, that a Bishop ought to be without crime, the husband of one wife, hath these wordes being truly translated. The Apostle stoppeth the mouthes of Heretiques which condemne Mariage, shewing that it is not an vncleane thing, but so reuerent, that with the same a man may ascend vnto the holy Throne, by that he meaneth the state of a Bishop. It foloweth there further. And herewith he chastiseth and restraineth the vnchaste persons, not permitting them who haue twise married, to attaine such rone. For whereas he kepeth no beneuolence towards his wife deceaced, how can he be a good gouernour? &c. Thus S. Chrysostom.

Chrysosto.  
in. 1. ca. ad  
Titum. bo.  
mil. 2.

Ye do wel to make muche of a litle. And what litle is that? Is it any other thing, then we alwaies haue acknowleged, and graunted vnto you, that a married man may be made a Bishop, and that by Gods expresse woordes mariage is not of it selfe a lette, but that therewith a man may be promoted vnto the holy state of a Bishop? Is there any more for you in this place

place of S. Chrysostome? Come to the point M. Iewel. You and your felowes haue vttered many hote wordes by mouth and pen against vs, as though we folowed the Cerdonistes, Marcionistes, Manichees, Taciás, Seueriás, and other olde pestilent heretikes, who condemned marriage, as a thing vncleane and displeasing God. But how oftentimes haue ye ben tolde by vs, that we are farre from that wicked opinion? who is ignorát how much the Catholikes haue written and preached in praise and cōmendation of lawfull and Godly wedloke? Is it not wel known, that we geue vnto it a farre more honour then ye doo? For do we not honour it with the name of a holy Sacrament, whereas ye cal it but a state of life?

The point whereabout we varie, is this. Ye hold that is is laulful for al persons to marie, be they Priestes, Monkes, Friers, Nonnes, or of what state or degree so euer they be. We say, that as it was laulful for such persons to marye before they promised God to liue the single life, and bound them selfe thereto by solemne vowe: so after the vowe duely made, that it is vnlaulful. We stand vpon the negatiue with the Church of Christe, ye affirme, and say much, but to the purpose ye proue nothing. And as for this place of S. Chrysostome, how can ye vse it to any reliefe of your cause? Shal this be your Argument, With Matrimonie a man may be promoted to the state of a Bishop: *Ergo*, a Bishop hauing made a solemne vow to leade the single life, may take a wife, and be married? If this be not your Argument, what elles can ye make of it? If ye haue no better Argumentes then this, ye may not be angry with them, that shal call your yokefellowes, Queanes, and your children, bastardes.

The state  
of the que-  
stion con-  
cerning ma-  
riage.



verely al the Burgeses of your Parlamentes, with the helpe of al your brethren, shal neuer make them, honest wiues, nor these, true begoten.

And here remember M. Iewel, that as the first parte of this saying of S. Chrysostome, which you allege for you, maketh nothing for your Mariage of Votaries: so the later parte is altogether contrarie to the proceedinges of your fleshly felowes. For it condemneth vtterly their filthy bigamie, or second yoking. Some of your companions, who being Priestes, and religious, and vsurping the roome of a Bishop (not farre from Sarisburie) as you do, being olde of yeres, but ful of luste, who for chastities sake (and God wote for none other cause) their former olde queanes being departed this life, haue yoked vnto them yonge Strompers, contrary to S. Chrysostom, and also to S. Paule. S. after Chrysostomes iudgement, would (I dare say) geue you hartty thanks, and wel rewarde you too, if you could defend their second yoking. How I may terme it, I knowe not. For I trow it ought not to be called Bigamie, sithens the first yoking was not mariage. For a fuller answer to al this brought here our of S. Chrysostome, I referre the Reader to my Confutation of the Apologie, where this Replier hath set forth the matter for Priestes Mariage, and furnished it with the same stufte. If the Apologie be not his workmanship, I crye him mercie. Verely I am perswaded, and so be many mo, that this ambitious Replie, and that rash Apologie, be egges of one hennes laying.

In the cō-  
futation  
Fol. 75.  
Gr.

Chrysost.  
in epist. ad  
Hebraeos  
lum. 7.

Wel let vs see other your best stufte: *Use marriage with discretion* (saith S. Chrysostome by you alleged)

and

and thou shalt be the Chiefe in the kingdom of heauen.

Why fir, what auaileth this to the iustifying and making good of the incestuous contracte betwen men and women of your sectes, that haue vowed chastitie? As for example, what helpeth this the case of Martin Luther the Austen Fryer, who yoked him selfe to Caterin Bore the Nonne of Nymick in Saxonie, or of your great frend and Maister, Peter Martyr the regular Chanon of S. Augustines order, who likewise yoked him selfe vnto Dame Catherine the Nonne of Metz in Lorraine, that stole out of her cloister by night, and ranne away with an honest mans wife of Metz to Strasburg, which honest mans wife married to Emanuel the Iewe ( that afterward came to Cambridge, and there read an Hebrue lesson) her husband being a liue, as he tolde me the tale him selfe with weeping eyes at Metz, as I passed toward Italie through Lorraine.

Whereas ye make S. Paule to say, that *matrimonic is honorable in al persons*, I iudge ye wil say, it was not very honorable in these two persons. And yet forsooth it was allowed for good among your holy brethren of Strasburg, bicause the true husband was a Papist. Moreouer touching this saying of S. Chrysostom, how can they vse marriage moderately, and with discretion, betwen whom it was vnlawful, and wicked from the beginning?

In the last place, as an auctoritie of greatest force, to knit vp the knotte of the Vowebreakers mariages, S. Hieromes recorde is alleged. But O Lorde, out of which worke of his is it alleged! Euen out of the first booke against Iouinian the heretike, defending the sacrilegious wedlocke of wiued Monkes, and husbanded Nonnes,

Peter Martyr yoked in Euangelical wedlocke to dame Caterin the Nonne of Metz. Emanuel the lewy to the Regesters vwife of Metz her husband lyuing.

as M. Iew. now doth. What mayst thou (good Reader) more woonder at in this Superintendent? His impudencie, that is not ashamed to name S. Hierom, as though he spake any worde for the maintenance of Votaries wedlockes, who of set purpose most vehemently and learnedly wrote against them, and against Iouinian the great patrone of the same: or his crafty wickednesse, that would so begyle the simple and vnlearned Reader with the auctoritie of so holy and so auncient a Father, dissembling the argument whereof he treated, which being disclosed, it is easily perceiued, how litle he furthereth such abominable bargaines?

But some wil say. Be not the wordes alleged by M. Iewel to be founde in S. Hierome? I graunt they are founde. So the wordes that Satan tempted our Sauour withal, are founde in the Scripture. Yet were they not truly alleged. It is not hard to peeke a fewe wordes out of any writer, which being set alone may seme to founde against some truth, yea against the writers principal intent. Howbeit the wordes that be here alleged out of S. Hierom, be neither against the writers purpose, nor for M. Jewels purpose. For onely they proue, that the custome of promoting married men to be Priestes, was not quite growen out of vse in S. Hieromes time. For though he say, that in his daies Priestes were made of married men, yet he semeth not to meane, that they vsed to company in bedde with wiues. Thereof thus he writeth in the same booke. *Si laicus & quicumque fidelis orare non potest, nisi careat officio coniugali, Sacerdoti, cui semper pro populo offerenda sunt sacrificia, semper*

Math. 4.  
Psal. 90.

Hieron.  
aduersus  
Iouinian.  
lib. 1.

*orandum est. Si semper orandum est, ergo semper carendum est matrimonio.* If one of the laeticie, or any faithful person who so euer he be, can not praye (that is to say, can not geue him selfe wholly to prayer, as when he receiueth our Lordes body, for thereof he speaketh specially) onlesse he cease from the dutie of wedlocke: a Priest by whom Sacrifices must alwaies be offered vp for the people, must alwaies praye. If he must alwaies praye, then must he alwaies be without matrimonie, that is, without the worke of matrimonie.

Thus thou seest good Reader, how euident and strong a truth it is, that he who hath ones vowed chastitie, as Priestes in the West Church, Monkes, Friars, and Nonnes haue done, can not lawfully go backe to Mariage, and that M. Iewel going about to proue the contrary, that is to say, that they may marrie, is not hable to bring one example of the Primitive Church, nor one testimonie of any auncient writer, that maketh directly, or by necessary sequels for that purpose, But diuerting from the point of the question, he allegeth places and testimonies to proue, that married men were at the beginning made Priestes and Bishops (as we graunt they were, for lacke of others so meete as they were for that function) being a truth denied by no man: and can not bring one example of the olde Church, sentence, or peece of sentence, whereby it may clearely appeare, that any man was euer first made Priest, and afterward married, and was allowed for so doing.



Jewel.

Epiphanius writeth thus of certaine of his time, Repudiant nuptias, at non libidinem. In honore enim apud illos est, non sanctitas, sed Hypocrisis: They refuse Marriage, not filthy luste. For they esteeme not Holines, but Hypocrisie. Who seeke not, that in the Church of Rome, Priestes, Bishoppes, and Cardinales, notwithstanding they be viterly forebiddene to haue Vvges, yet are easily allowed to haue Concubines? They them selues haue confessed it by these vvorde vnto the vvorlde: Etiam in hac vrbe Romana meretrices, vt Matronae incedunt per urbem, seu mula vehuntur: quas affectantur de Media die Nobiles familiares Cardinalium, Clericiq;: Euen here in this Citie of Rome, harlottes passe through the streetes, or ride vpon their mules, like honest Gentle women: And Gentlemen of the Cardinales bandes, and Priestes at noone daies waite vpon them.

Harding.

You flye, you flye away M. Jewel out of the feelde. You runne from the state of the question to bye matters, and voyd talke. You pretend to proue and make good the mariages of the Apostates your lewde Brethren, who haue by solemne vow bounde them selues to liue single, and now seing your selfe not hable to performe it, and not hauing so muche as one example, or any one sentence of an auncient Father for the same: you diuert from fortifying your owne doctrine, to carping of others faultes. To be shorte, what so euer is euil, we blame it, nolesse then you. But take this for a general lesson. The iniquitie of other mennes lyues, shal neuer be a iustification of your false doctrine.

What meane you here to allege Epiphanius? whom iudge you? or whom sclaunder you? Euil haue he that euil



euil thinketh . Had your hart ben chaste and cleane, your mouth had not ben so fowle , you would neuer haue stirred that stinking puddel . Howbeit to note , how vprightly you handle euery mater : *Epiphanius* doth not write thus so much of certaine of his time, as of the Heretikes named *Origeniani* in general , that for the more part lyued long before his time. Againe the case between the Catholike Clergie (to whom your slaunderours suspicion is directed) and those heretikes , is not like. They reiected and condemned mariage , bicause they had an euil opinion of it , and iudged Conception , to be of it selfe an euil thing. But Prieltes and Clerkes of the Catholike Churche absteyne from mariage, not bicause they haue any euil opinion of it, or of Gods ordinance, but for conscience sake in consideration of their vowe , which they know them selues bounde to keepe.

*Origeniani.*

The heresie of the *Origenians*.

Where you say, that in the Churche of Rome, Priestes , Bishops , and Cardinals are easily allowed to haue Concubines, it is such a notorious and slaunderous lye, as becommeth no man to make, but such a notorious lyer, and slaunderer , as you are . God graunt that once such Adders tonges be stayd from irksom hissing, as their venomous teeth be yet stayd from deadly byting.

A notorious and slaunderous lye.

And what impudencie is it to say, as you do , that Bishops and Cardinals them selues confesse , that they are allowed Concubines ? Where haue they confessed it? Gentle Reader looke backe , I pray thee , and read the wordes that he allegeth, againe . For the better vnderstanding of the mater , this much is to be knowen. *Paulus tertius* the Pope, moued with the spirite of God , and desyroust to reforme the Churche , gaue charge to nyn

The godly pur-  
pose of  
*Paulus tertius*.

monolai

Y Y

the best

the best learned, wifest, and most godly and zelous men that he knewe, 4. Cardinals, 3. Bishops, and. 2. others (of whom the worthy man Cardinal Poole of blessed and famous memorie was one) to enquire and serche out, what abuses and disorders were in the Church, and specially in the courte of Rome, and to signifie the same vnto his Holines, to thinrent those being taken away, a holesom reformation might be made.

They went together, applied their studie and wisdom to that effecte, and brought to ende, that they had in charge. In the number of abuses, they signified this for one, which M. Iewel here by his false translation making it worse then it is, grateth vpon. *In hac etiam urbe meretrices &c. furthermore (say they) in this Citie harlots go in the streetes, or ride on mule, like Matrones, and Gentilmen of the Cardinals families, and Clerkes go after them at midde daye.* This is the disorder they complained of, and would to be redressed. Now of this how can M. Iewel inferre his sclaunderous conclusion, *Ergo Priestes, Bishops, and Cardinals, be easily allowed to haue Concubines at Rome?* Can not the yong Gentilmen of the Cardinals families be founde in faulte, but it must be laid to the Cardinals charge them selues? What if certaine of M. Iewels men were founde gyilty of theste and murder, and therefore deserued hanging: were it reasont to say, that M. Iewel were a felon, and worthy to be hanged?

Moreouer what hatred and malice beareth this Minister to Priestes, who here for *Clerici*, odiously translateth Priestes, whereas the worde now signifieth generally those that be toward the Church, be they scolers, inferiour

In Concilio  
Delectorū  
Cardinalium.

inferiour Ministers, singingmen, or such others? And al this to bring Priestes into contempt and hatred. But if his malice wanne credite among the ignorant, what could that relyue his cause? Were it true that some Priestes at a time were sene folowing harlottes in Rome, yet wil not that iustifie the Priestes, Mounkes, and Friers, that marye harlottes in England.

*Iewel.*

As touching them, vvhom, it so muche greeueth you, M. Hardinge, to be called Martyrs, you haue slaine, not only such, and such, vvhom it liketh you, by your ouvne Name, if ye haue not forgotten your ouvne Name, to cal Renegates, but also great numbers of others moe, Married, Vnmarried, Learned, Vnlearned, Olde, Yonge, Boies, Maides, Laicemenne, Priestes, Bishops, Archbishops, vvithout mercie. Tescourged them vvith rodde: ye sette burning torches to their hâdes, ye cut of their tōgues, ye hâged them, ye beheaded them, ye burnte them to ashes, ye tooke the poore innocent babe falling from the mothers wombe, and threwe it cruelly into the fier. Briefly, ye did vvith them, vvhat so euer your pleasure was.

*Harding.*

*Answer to M. Jewels tragical complaint of Iustice executed against heretiques in Quene*

*Maries time.*

**T**O this tragical complaint; that here you haue amplified, and with al your Rhetorique enlarged, thus I Answer. So many of your Brothers, and Sisters, as in Quene Maries time, (for thereof you speake) either for heinous heresie were burnt, or for theste, and robberies were hanged, or for Treason and Rebellion were beheaded; or by any waye pte to death: they had no more then they deserued, and the Lawes appointed. Concerninge the manner of their executions

cutions and punishmentes, you describe it so, as a man may point vnto you, and say, there goeth a scholer of Iohn Foxes. In his lying Actes and Monumentes you seme to haue ben a great studēt. When you shal haue pro- ued or any other for you, that those incorrigible, and detestable heretikes, theeues, Churcherobbers, murde- rers, rebelles, and Traitors, for whole deserued and iust punishment you make so greuous mone, were Inno- centes: then crye out hardely, *O M. Harding what reck- ning wil you yeelde, when so much innocent bloude / halbe required at your handes?* Vntil you prooue the Crowe is whit, crye not so out vpon vs, I pray you, but geue vs leaue to thinke, and say stil, the Crowe is blacke. If you haue no better proues for your newe Doctrines, then such idle exclamations, and void amplifications, you may sit stil, spare your paines in writing great bookes, and (without you repent) wyne Hel at the ende with more ease.

Wel to procede further with you, and to rippe vp this whole mater: That which here you say of vs, is either true, or it is false. If it be false, we are cleared, the shame is yours. If it be true: It was either lawfully done, or vn- lawfully. If lawfully, then are we not thus to be accu- sed. If vnlawfully, it was the faulte of men, it is not the fault of our doctrine. Admit the doctrine of the Catho- lique Church, whereof we treat, and wherein iuste Lawes shal condemne vs, let vs susteine the due pu- nishment.

Lawes  
to punish  
heretikes  
by Death  
Henrici  
Quinti.  
Anno. 2.

If you shal saie, that the Lawe, that punisheth he- retikes by death, blame not vs, who made it not, as ye knowe. Blame King Henry the fifth a Prince of renou- med me-



med memorie, and al states of our Countrie assembled in  
Parlament in his time, by whom this Lawe was enacted  
and established. Blame *Martianus*, *Gratianus*, *Honorius*, & *Mansi-*  
*Theodosius*, and *Valentinianus*, godly and famous Empe-  
rours, who made the like Lawe: blame Constantine the  
Great, who so farre detested the heresie of the Arians,  
that (as Nicephorus writeth) he commaunded al their  
bookes to be burnt, and al them to be put to death, that  
should be founde to haue any of those bookes in their cu-  
stodie. Blame S. Augustine, who praiseth Nabuchodo-  
nosor, for that he made a decree of death, against the  
blasphemers of God. Which decree he calleth *Piam &*  
*laudabilem legem*, a godly, and a laudable Lawe. Blame  
King Henry the eight, who (as ye knowe) made a Law  
for punishment of heretiques holding and mainteining  
false doctrine touching the six Articles. To conclude,  
Blame Beza, and your great Rabbi Iohn Caluine him-  
selfe, who in printed bookes defende it to be lawfull, to  
put heretiques to death, and at Geneua procured Mi-  
chael Seruetus a Spaniard, to be burnt for the Arians  
heresie.

Whereas you make al this greuous complainte against  
vs, and burthen vs with crueltie, remember M. Iewel,  
what wrong you doo vs. For we were not they, by  
whom your brethern were put to death. We, I say, who  
are Clerkes, and Ecclesiastical persons. It was the Ciuile  
power, the Prince I meane, that executed the Lawe vpon  
them, which is the common Lawe of al Christendome:  
which Prince, as S. Paul saith, *is the Minister of God, to*  
*revenge*, and *punish the doers of euil*, and beareth not the  
*sword without cause*. The Church, as you knowe, pro-  
cedeth

*Cod. de*  
*Haeticis*  
*& Mani-*  
*chais, li. 5*  
*Cod. ne*  
*sanctum*  
*baptisma*  
*ueretur.*  
*lib. 2.*  
*Nicephor.*  
*Ecclesiast.*  
*Histor. lib.*  
*8. cap. 18.*  
*Co. 25.*  
*August. ad*  
*Bonifacium*  
*epist. 50.*  
*Contra he-*  
*teras Pe-*  
*tilian. lib.*  
*2. cap. 92.*  
*et epist. 43.*  
*M. Iewel*  
*vvould*  
*the Ciuile*  
*Magis-*  
*trates*  
*iuste cor-*  
*rection,*  
*to be este-*  
*med the*  
*Catholik*  
*Clergies*  
*crueltie.*  
*Rom. 13.*



cedeth no further against heretikes, then to excommunication. The Gouvernours whereof when they finde them desperate and incorrigible, and wholly bent to peruerter others: by right of Gods worde do pronounce Excommunication against them, that the parte, which is hole, be preserved from infectiō. If the Princes for the time being, iudge such ennemies of the Faith vnworthy to liue in their realmes and dominions, and thinke it a more mercie to drawe their sword of correction vpon them, then to further increase of their owne dānation to suffer them to seduce others, and to drawe multitudes of their people into the same pitte of perdition: what cause haue ye, why ye should so tragically crie out vpon vs therefore?

And to say somewhat for the Prince in this case, Al good men, I doubt not, wil allow the saying of S. Augustine. *Sicut est plerunq; crudelis fallax adulatio, sic semper misericors est iusta correctio*. As, most commonly deceitful flatterie is cruel, so alwaies iuste punishment is merciful. Who euer was more charitable, and more pitiful then Moyse? In so much that praying to God to pardon the people for their heynous offence, he said: *O Lorde, either forgiue them this fault, or if thou wilt not, put me out of thy booke, which thou hast written*. Was he then (saith S. Augustine) suddainly become cruel, when comming downe from the hil, he commaunded so many thousandes to be slaine? Would God you M. Iewel, and your felowes, who repine so much at the due punishmentes of your lewde Brothers, and Sisters, would commend to your myndes the counsel that S. Augustine gaue to the Donatistes in his tyme, saying, *Prius quid faciant, postea quid patiantur aduertant*. Let them consider, first, what they do, and afterward,

Aug. con.  
tra lit. Pe  
titi. lib. 2.  
cap. 67.

Exo 32.  
Ibidem.  
cap. 86.

August. li.  
3. ad epist.  
Parmen.  
cap. 6.

terward, what they suffer. The Law of God commaundeth him, that bringeth the people by any persuasio<sup>n</sup> from God to the worship of false Goddes, to be put to death. Of the cause of this Law expressed in these wordes, *quia locutus est ut vos auerteret à Domino Deo vestro*, bicause he hath spoken whereby to turne you from your Lorde God: the mind of the lawemaker is to be vnderstanded. And true it is, they, that teache heretical doctrine, and expounde the Scriptures to an heretical and peruerse sense, do leade men from the true worship of God, and so do exhort them vnto the worship of false Gods. For it foloweth necessarily, that euery doctrine, which speaketh of the worship of God, if it be not of God, it is of the Deuill. And therefore he that receiueth it, receiueth the Deuill. and he that vseth persuasions to others that it be receiued, leadeth and carieth them from God. For S. Paule calleth the prohibition of meates, and of Mariage, *Doctrinas Daemoniorum, the doctrines of the Devils.*

*What is to be iudged of these Protestantes Martyrs.*

Wheras as you wil nedes haue them to be called Martyrs, and now be canonizate a Gods name by. M. Foxe, and set in a solemne Calender, that holy daies and hye feastes be kept for them, who cā otherwise do, but laugh at you? *Martyrē non facit pœna, sed causa*, It is not the paine, that maketh a Martyr, but the cause, saith S. Augustine. Remēber you not, what he writeth of such companiōs? It may serue very fitly, for to be said vnto you. *Tota questio est (saith he) utrum vos non male agatis, quibus tanti schismatis sacrilegium obijcit: orbis terrarum, cuius questionis discussione neglecta, superflua loquimini, & cum viuatis ut latrones, mori vos iactatis ut Martyres.*

The

The whole question is, whether ye doo not euil, whom the worlde chargeth with the mischeuous crime of so great schisme, the due discussion of which question ye leaue, and speake voide and vaine wordes. And whereas ye liue as Theeues, ye bragge that ye dye, as Martyrs.

Aug. contra  
secundā  
Gaudēij.  
epist. c. 12.

In an other place likewise saith he to such heretiques, as being persecuted for their desert, chalenged vnto them the glorie of Martyrdom, as you and your companions do, *Recte ista dicerentur à vobis quarentibus Martyrum gloriam, si Martyrum causam haberetis.* These thinges were wel said of you seeking for the glorie of Martyrs, in case ye had the cause of Martyrs..

Augu. ad  
Bonifaciā  
epist. 50.  
Tvvo  
sortes of  
Martyrs.  
Psal. 42.

According to his teaching there be true Martyrs, and false Martyrs. That voice in the Psalme, he vnderstandeth to be the voice of true Martyrs, being desirous to be discerned from false Martyrs. *Iudica me Deus, &c. Iudge me o God, and discerne my cause from the people that is vnholly.* He said not (saith S. Augustine) *discerne pœnam meam, sed discerne causam meam*, discerne my paine, but discerne my cause.

Ibidem.  
Tvvo  
sortes of  
persecu-  
tions.

And as there be true and false Martyrs, so he saith, there be two sortes of persecutions. *There is* (saith he) *an vnjust persecution, whiche the wicked make against the Church of Christe, and there is a iust persecution, whiche the Churches of Christ make against the wicked. The Church is blessed, that suffereth persecution for righteousness, they be miserable, that suffer persecution for vnrighteousnes.*

Now if ye can iustifie your cause no better, then ye haue done hitherto, crake, and bragge no more of your Martyrdomes: Let M. Foxe make no Martyrs. Or if ye wil needes allow him for a Martyrmaker stil, let him be  
warrant

warned to vse a more discretion, then heretofore he hath vsed, els his huge booke of Actes and Monumentes can not long kepe credit. For what wil wisemen thinke, euen they of your owne side, when they shal consider, what persons he hath canonizate, and registred for Martyrs? As Robert King of Dednam, Robert Debnam of Elbergholt, Nicolaus Marth of Dednam, who were hanged for Felonie: William Cowbridge burnt at Oxford, who as it is openly knowen, could not abide the name of Christe, but said it was a fowle name, and that Christe is not the redemer of the worlde, and helde many other blasphemous heresies: Peter the Germaine, who besides that he was a Sacramentarie, helde opinion, that our Lorde tooke not fleshe of the blessed virgin Marie his Mother: Dicke Adames hanged at Bristow for felonie, and Willia Flower, that drew forth his hanger, and strake the Priest in S. Margaretes Church in Westminster, as he was ministring the blessed Sacrament to the people. Al these, and many others of like qualities, murderers, theeuers, Church robbers, rebelles, and Traitours, and by your owne confession detestable heretiques, haue ye made Martyrs. I speake not of Sir Iohn Oldecastel, and Sir Roger Aston, put to death for high treason, whom neuerthelesse Foxe hath canonizate for holy Martyrs: Neither of Dame Eleonor Cobham, bannished for conspiring the death of King Henry the sixth by wytchecraft, who in Foxes great booke is registred for a worthy Confessour. Whereby it seemeth that he hath a commission (from whens I knowe not) to make, not onely Martyrs, but also Confessours. As for Virgins, I trowe these men canonizate none, for their sprite brooketh not

ZZ very

Actes and  
Monu-  
mentes.

Pag. 496.

Iohn  
Foxes ho-  
ly Mara-  
tyrs.

Pag. 570.

Pag. 571.

Pag. 1139

Anno. 2.  
Henrici. 5.



very wel, that holy state of lyfe.

Whereas he is about to set foorth his famous *Actes and Monumentes* againe, as I heare, if he had a desire to increafe his number, and wil take the paines to come o-uer into the Low countrie: He shal finde stoare of new mater, yea of as good Martyrs, as he hath made any yet, ten, twelue, sixteen in a Clustre hanging vpo one bough by the waies side in sundry places. Their liues, and Faithes were so notable, their hartes so stout and constant in cōtempt of the holy Sacramentes and al godly thinges: that I dare say, if he had the Registres and instrumentes made of their examinations, answeres, bolde and hardy deedes in burning liberaries, and religious Howses, in robbing and spoiling of Churches, and Abbaies, in doing villanie to holy Nonnes by diuers waies, and in rebelling openly against their lawful Prince: he could not find in his harte for the Gospels sake, to let them passe not rewarded with the renome of his Canonization. But now to come to the particulers of your tragical complaint.

*It greenueth vs, you say, to see your cōpanions called Martyrs.* No, no, M. Iewel, we enuy not you that felicitie. It greenueth not vs so much, that such deuilish wretches be called Martyrs, as it greenueth vs to see their pride, their wilful blindenes, the *efficacie of errour*, that S. Paule speaketh of, which for sinne, *God sendeth upon them, that they gene credite vnto lying*, their malice, their stubbornnesse, their wickednesse, their contempt of God, and al godly thinges, their damnation. It greenueth vs to see you and

2. Thes. 2.

August. de them to be such, and therefore ye persecute vs more, in  
vniuersa. Ec- this respect, then we do you, as S. Augustin saith, that the  
clesia. c. 17 *sonne persecuteth the Father more by lying il, then the Fa-*  
ther



ther persecuteth him by chafesing. And in an other place he writeth speaking of Dame Sara, and Agar her womā seruant, *Si melius discutiamus, magis illa persequatur Sarā superbiendo, quā illam Sara coercendo.* As much to say, If we examine the mater exactly, we shal finde, that Agar did put Sara to more grieve by her proude demeanour, then Sara did Agar by correcting her.

What you meane by putting me in remembrance of the name of a Renegate, I do wel vnderstand, and see therein your malice, and myne owne felicitie. Had you wist, how in more spiteful wise to wreake your rancour vpon me, by this you shewe, what desire you had openly to vnter it to my disgrace. In good sooth I can soone forgeue you for it, bicause therby you renue my ioy, that thus am put in mynd, from how dangerous, and damnable, to how safe and good a state the mercie of God hath deliuered me, in that by his grace he hath reduced me from stragling with heretiques through commō corruption of the time, to rest in the folde of Christes Church. As I repent that once I stragled with you, though not so farre from Christes heard as you: so to confesse, and acknowledge the same, I see not why I should be greatly a shamed. For had I ben a stubborne and a farre gone heretique, as in truth myne error was humaine: neuerthelesse in that case, who so euer is amended, by iudgement of S. Augustine, his estimation thereby is nothing impaired. For saith he, *Maiores ingenij est animositate flamas confutendo extingere, q̄ falsitate nebulas intelligendo vitare.* It is a point of more witte, to quenche the flames of stourdisse by confessing error, then to auoide the clowdes of falshod by vnderstanding as much to say by shift of witte to escape.

Answer  
to the  
Obiectiō  
of the  
name of  
a Renegate.

Vvho is  
a Renegate.

He is a Renegate, that forsaketh God, and his truth, and wilfully departeth from the Churche, not he that lea- ueth error, and commeth vnto Gods truth, and repo- seth him selfe in the lappe of the Catholik Church. I wil not folow you here M. Iewel, and by casting durte as it were vppon your coate againe, defile my handes. If I had desire to prooue the name of a Renegate to ap- pertain by right vnto you, it were soone done. Your owne open, and vnforced subscription at Oxford to this very Article whereof now I treate, and to sundry others, which now you impugne, must be an euerlasting testimo- nie against you.

The married, and vnmarried, yonge, and olde, boyes, and Maides, and the rest that you reckon vp in your long rolle, we haue not slaine (I tel you once againe) as maliciously you charge vs: We, I meane, that are of the Clergie, against whom specially you vtter your spite. It was the Prince, that comaunded according to the aun- cient Lawes of al Christendom, iustice to be executed vpon them, for that they (beside robberies, Sacrilege, trea- son, rebellion, and other heinous crimes comitted by the more parte of them) not only resisted the truth, despised Christian religion, contemned the holy Sacramentes, and were open blasphemers of God: but also did what in their power was, stirre others to like wickednes.

Neither were boyes slaine, as you say. Iustice was with more equitie and moderatiō executed vpon the blasphe- mous, and traiterous offenders of al sortes, then their hor- rible crimes deserued. Among them that suffered death, there were no boyes. As they were olde in malice, so were they not boyes in yeres.

Bishops

Bishops and Archbishops you put in your reckoning, to aggravate the mater. Archebishop there was but one, your selfe doo knowe . But ô Lorde, what an Archebishop! The See of Cantorbury had neuer any such, sithen the English natiõ receiued the Faith in S. Gregories time. If he had ben either good in life , or constant in Faith, or true of promise made by solemne Othe to the See Apostolike: he had neuer yeelded him selfe to be made an instrument of so many and so great euils, but with Bishoply auctoritie , grauitie , and constancie , would haue withdrawn the Prince, and his ambitious Ministers, frõ their vnlawful lustes, and wicked attemptes . Of this Archebishop ye haue litle cause to crake . As, for wordly dignities sake, once he forooke his olde Catholique Faith, and fel to profess your newe Gospelling Faith : So assoone as he had lost his dignities, for life to be graunted him , he was content to forsake your new faith . And in witnesse therof with his owne hand he subscribed to a great number of Billes containing the confession of the Catholike faith . At length when he sawe , that for his desertes he should needes dye: for anger he defied Catholique faith, Church, and al, and like a dogge returned to his vomite, so litle grace had the manifolde wickednes of his former life deserued.

Cranmare  
the Arche  
bishop of  
Cantors  
burie.

Crāmares  
subscrip  
tions.

*Some were scourged with Roddes, you say. Whether this be true or no, I know not. The same is a meete punishmēt for boyes . Neither is it altogether a strange and an vnwound thing, a Bishop to vse such manner of correction. For S. Augustine in an epistle to a noble man called Marcellinus, speaking of scourging with Roddes, saith ( Qui modus coercionis & à Magistris artium liberalium, & ab ipsis*

Scourgis  
vvith  
rodde,  
an olde  
punish  
mēt vsd  
of Bish  
hops.  
August.  
epist. 159.

*parentibus, & sapè etiam in iudicijs solet ab Episcopis haberi*) that it was a manner of correction vsed of Schoolemasters, and Parentes, and also oftentimes of Bishoppes in iudgements.

*Some (you say) had burning torches set to their handes.* We wil beleue it, when we vnderstād it was so. *Some had their tonges cut out of their head.* If we denie it, by what meanes can you prooue it? Though the same be cōmonly done in Fraunce towards heretiques that wil not recant, to thintent they be not heard to blasphemè, as in Spaine they put a Gagge in their mouthes for the same purpose: yet in England it hath not ben vsed. And if any had his tongue cut out, as you reporte, it was not done without example of antiquitie. For so did Iustinian the Emperour cut out by the roote the tongue of an heretique named Seuerus, Bishop of Antioche. Better it were, that both tongue, and harte were cut out, then that God should be blasphemed.

Cutting  
out of he-  
retiques  
tongues,  
an old pu-  
nishment.  
Nicephor.  
lib. 17. c. 2

*Some were hanged.* True it is, but remember you wherefore? Verily either for theste, or robberie, or for murder, or for sacriledge, or for treason, and rebellion.

vViat  
Headed.

*Some were beheaded.* I graunte, as Wiate, and some others, that for Treason had by Lawe deserued that death at the Princes handes. But how many thorough great Clemencie escaped with their heades, who had losse them, if mercie had not tempered the rigour of Iustice?

*But some were burnt to Asshes.* And that iustly by the auncient Lawes of al Christian Realmes. Why might not Queene Mary doo in that case, as other Kinges, and Princes

Princes doo in their Dominions , and as your Master Iohn Caluine him selfe , did to Seruerus the heretike at Geneua?

Yea, but a poore Innocent Babe falling from the mothers Wombe, was taken, and thrown cruelly into the Fier. What if it were denied you, that euer any such thing was done? Let vs heare , how you are hable to prooue it . O say you, it must needes be true . For we finde it so written by M . Iohn Foxe in his great booke of *Actes and Monumentes* . Why Sir dare you so constantly auouche this facte onely vppon the reporte of Foxe ? As though he had not tolde vs in his false Martyrologe , a thousand mo lyes then this ? I pitie you M . Iewel , that craking so muche of antiquitie , and appealing continually to the Fathers of the six hundred yeres , you are now driuen to stay your credite vppon Foxe , who hath into that Huge volume infarced lyes , moe in number , and notabler for vanitie , then euer were raked together into any one heape, or booke . Wel, if al were false, that here you tel , then haue you losse a ioily tale . Foxe him selfe reporteth , when Commisisioners in London vpon a complaint examined the mater , that it was founde but probable . And probable he meaneth in the iudgement of them , who gladly finde fault with al that was done touching the punishment of heresie in Queene Maries reigne . Now the thing ( if any such thing were done at al ) being so Notorious , so openly executed , so fewe yeresthen past since it was doone , so many men yet lyuing , that wouldhaue ben present at the examination in case they had bene commaunded , the charges of the journey from Garnesey ( where it is said to haue bene done :

The fable of the wo man of Garnesey burnt for heresie with a childe in her belly.

This fable by report of Foxe vvas founde, not certaine, but probable.



done ) to London being borne , and could haue brought true witnesse , neuerthelesse to be founde but probable : I weene , it wil not to any wise man appeare very probable.

Of the  
woman  
of Garne-  
sey's childe  
falling out  
of her bel-  
ly into  
the fire

How be it let the Fable be a Storie , and the same be taken for true , according as Foxe doth describe it to the aduantage, and as you M. Iewel report it : That in Garnesey three women , that is , the mother , and her two daughters were burnt , and that one of the Daughters was with childe , and the childe issued from her wombe being riuied with the fier , and was consumed together with the fier . What of al this ? In whom was the faulte , in the officer , that tooke not the childe out of the fier , or in the vnnatural mother , that brought it into the fier ? In the Storie there is mention made of a childe , and of the mother , but of the childes Father , there is no woorde spoken . It appeareth very credible , that the historiographer was a shamed to name the childes Father , least so he should haue defaced the glorie of the mothers Martyrdom . For I would faine know who was the husband to the daughter . M. Fox doth not expresse it .

Paratine  
of Garne-  
sey.

But you wil say , how so euer the childe was begotten , the mother being in that case should haue bene by no Law , iustice , or reason committed vnto the fier . True it is , a woman in that case may for once claime the benefite of her belly . Mary I haue heard Lawiers say , that if whiles she is in prison , she play the strompet againe , by Lawe the iudge may denie her the benefite of her belly , and geue sentence of death vpon her . But as for your pratteling parrot Paratine ( for so was her name as M. Fox registreth her ) it was not knowen to the Iudge , that she was with childe .

childe. Had it bene knownen, doubtlesse her death had bene differred vntil she had ben brought on bed. But the honest woman, because she would not shame the Gospel, keping it priuy from the Magistrates, claimed not the benefite of the Lawe, and so now not only like an harlot or Heretique, but like a Murtherer went desperatly to the fier, and murdered bothe her selfe, and her childe conceiued within her. So farre the Deuil carrieth them, whom he possesseth, and leadeth at his wil. This abominable facte God by his most iust iudgement reueled, to the condemnation bothe of her, and of the cause for which she dyed, by suffering the childe to fal from her wombe, in the sight of al that stood by.

Iudge now discrete Reader, to whom redoundeth the blame of the crime, whether to the Ministers of Iustice, who not knowing the thing, executed the Lawe: or to the woman, that for auoiding a worldly shame, concealing her owne turpitude, became a murtherer of her owne babe, before it came to perfection. So that she died guilty of three heinous crimes, of heresie, lecherie, and murther. And to these theste may be added for the fourth. For it appeareth by the tale, that Foxe him selfe to her best estimation telleth of her, that she was a thefe, as being accessorie to the honest woman Vincent Gosier, that stole a siluer gobbler. If the mater were wel examined, I doubt not she would be tried an honest woman, and a fitt vessel to receiue the glorie of these newe inuented Martyrdomes.

Here I appeale vnto your owne wisdom M. Iewel, and demaunds of you, what you could, or would haue done for that vnperfit and dead childe, in that case, bet

V what  
vvas to be  
don vvith  
the dead

Carcasse  
of Paratia  
nes babe.

ter, then was done. If they had taken it out of the fyer, what should that haue auailed? Life it had none, and therefore was it not to be baptized. Sense it had none: and therefore had it not ben holpen by sauing it from burning. As for burial, sith it was neither Christened, nor come to be persite man: it was aswel burnt, and buried in earth, yea in some respecte better, bicause being burnt with the wicked mother, besides the more detestation of the horrible crime to the example of others, it was a testimonie against the mothers vnnaturalnes. Neither in deede truly to speake, was it a *poore innocent Babe*, as to aggrauate the facte, more rhetorically, then truly you reporte. For being a dead thing, as it could not be riche, or hurtful, so neither properly ought it to be called, *poore*, or *innocent*. This much considered, you haue gotten litle honestie to your Gospel M. Iewel, by reherfal of casting this *poore innocent Babe* into the fyer: And the mother your Syster in the Lorde, is fownd but a meane Martyr, and witnesse of the truth. Of the fruite of such Martyrdome, the famous Tree of Tybourne bringeth forth good stoare.

Tybourne  
Martyrs.

*Iewel.*

The worst vwoorde that proceeded from them, was this, O Lord, forgaue them, They knowe not, vvhath they doo. O Lorde Iesu, receiue my Spirite. In the meane vvhile, ye stoode by, and delited your eies vvith the sight. Ye digged vp the poore carkasses of Godder Sainctes, that had bene buried longe before: ye serued them solemnely vvith processe, and ascited them to appeare at your Consistories, and by Publique sentence adjudged them to die the second death: and so, to the perpetual shame of your cruel solie, ye vvreakte your anger vpon the dead. O M. Hardinge, your conscience knowveth, these are no lyes: They are vvritten in the eies, and hartes of many thousandes. These be the markes of your Religion. O

vvhath

what reckninge wilt you yeelde, when so muche innocent Blood shalbe required at your handes? And where you say, Vvee must pulle the Olde Martyrs out of Heauen to place our ovvne, for that our Doctrine, and theirs (as you beare vs in bande) is quite contrary, al this is but a needeles ostentation of idle vvordes. Yf vauntes vvere proues, then vvete this mater fully ended. But vve say, that in these cases, that I haue mooned, you are not hable to allege one sufficient Clause, or Sentence of your side out of any of al the Olde learmed Fathers. And hitherto your muster appeareth but very simple, not vvithstanding the great promise of your Stoare.

*Harding.*

The pacience of your stincking Martyrs, who (say you) uttered no worse worde, then, *o Lorde forgeue them, o Lorde Iesu receiue my spirite*: is by you hyely commended. Pacience in an euil cause is no sufficient trial of a true Martyr. It is not suffering, but the cause of suffering, that maketh a Martyr. *Blessed are they that suffer persecution*, saith Christe, but there he addeth, *propter iustitiam*, for righteousness. How many, theeues, murtherers, and Traitours, see wee to suffer their death patiently? Yet are they not canonizate for Martyrs. Many among the Donatistes rooke their Death with as great pacience, and as hartely prayed for their Aduersaries, as any of al your Martyrs did. Margarete the wife of Dulcinus, when she came to suffer death at Nouaria in Lombardie for the filthy heresie of the Adamites, for whiche her husband had died before, song *Te Deum*, and shewed a maruelous pacience, and cōtempte of death. Peruse the Stories of Bohemia, and ye shal find, that bothe men and women put to death for that abominable heresie, suffered their executiō with suche quiet, pacience, and constancie: that it seemed to lerned men a worthy thing to be Cronicled. Verely of the

*Matt. 5.*

Pacience  
in dying,  
argueth  
no Mar-  
tyrdom.

*Anno. Do-  
1305.*

AAA ij glorie



glorie of pacience shewed at death, the Anabaptistes, that haue ben burnt in sundry places in our dayes, by al mens iudgement haue wonne the garland from you, and frō your brothers, and Systers, be they Lutherans, or Calvinistes. Neither haue al your Martyrs dyed with suche pacience, and quiet wordes, as here you talke of.

Burning  
of Dead  
carcasses,  
no nevv  
thing.

Touching the digging vp of the Carkasses, not of *Goddess Sainctes*, as you name them, but of the *Deuils Champions*, and the asciting of some that were before buried, to appeare at the Consistories: al this was not done for *wreaking of Anger*, as you feine, but for examples sake, that others might be frayed from folowing them, and for shew, how detestable their heresie was, and the same not without lawe, custome, and wel liking of Christian people. Neither altogether without the example of the Scriptures. For in them we reade, that the good king Iosias brake vp the Graues of wicked Priestes, and false Prophetes, and burned their bones to Ashes. So that this complaint toucheth the holy king Iosias, no lesse then the Catholiques.

Augustin.  
Epist. 50.

S. Augustine saith, that if the crimes objected against *Cecilianus*, were true, and could be plainly proued: *ipsum iam mortuum anathematizaremus*. we would accurse him now being dead. If a Curse may be extended vpon an heretique, after he is departed this worlde, whiche banisheth the soule from the communiō and societie of the faued companie: why may not the Carkasse of a notorious dead heretique be for examples sake digged out of halowed grownde appointed for the reuerent burial of those bodies, that when they liued were tabernacles of the holy Ghost: that after death they reste not with the  
bodies



bodies of them, from whom they diuided them selues by schisme and heresie, when they lyued? And therefore I aduise you M. Iewel, and your brothers, not to bestow great charges about your tounbes, and places of burial, least the time come, as certainly it shal come, enlesse for synne God vtterly forsake our Countrie: when your Carkasses shalbe digged out againe, and be serued as heretiques Carkasses these many hundred yeres haue ben: example whereof we haue in the Frenche Chronicles of one *Amalricus*, an heretique in S. Bernardes time, *In Chronis 1740* whose body at Paris was digged out of his graue, after his death, and burnt to Ashes, whiche punishment he was knowen being dead to haue deserued, when he lyued. Your owne brethren of Geneua are reported of late yeres to haue digged one out of his graue, and to haue hanged vp his dead carkasse vpon a Gibbet, for that he repented him of your heresies in his death bed, and receiued the blessed Sacrament, before he departed.

And how say you to your brethern of Basile? Did they not digge vp the carkasse of Dauid Georgius, and burne it with his Image long after he had ben buried? Shal it be lawful for you in England to burne the bones of S. Thomas of Cantorburie the Martyr, and for your brethren the Huguenotes in Fraunce to burne the holy Reliques of S. Irenæus that blessed and so auncient Martyr, of S. Martin, and S. Hilarie: and may not the Catholiques burne the carkasses, and bones of blasphemous Sacramentaries, and other heretiques?

But now to conclude, what meane you M. Iewel, thus to complaine of vs, and to accuse the Catholiques of Crueltie? Are your selues giltyes hereof? I meane

AAA iij. you,

David  
Georges  
Carkasse  
digged vp  
at Basile,  
and burnt  
with his  
Image.

you, your brethren, and them of your side, specially the ministers, and Superintendentes of England. Who are more cruel, they, that doo but execute an olde Lawe of death vnder the Prince according to commandement, or they, that hauing no lawe to put men to death, by al meanes procure, and cause suche a lawe to be made them selues? Who haue so importunately, so lowdely, so maliciously cryed out vpon the Prince, to draw her sworde against the Catoliques? Who cryed out stil for the law of Premunire to be extended against them, and last of al for the lawe of death to be enacted against them, as in cases of hye treason? How oftentimes haue ye required this your owne new law to be executed vpon learned, holy, and innocent men? Were it not that God stayeth the harte of the Prince, and inclined her vnto mercie and clemencie, ye would soone make al the worlde witnesse of the crueltie of your hartes.

I wil not here say so muche as I could, nor thinke it good to grate muche vpon this sore. Certaine it is, God seeth the crueltie of your hartes, and what deadly hatred ye beare towarde the Catholiques. What is either in you, or in vs amisse, our Lorde amend it. I wish you, and your brethren would wel consider, what S. Augustine saith to the Donatistes, whom ye farre passe in number, and malice of heresies. Thus it is. *Si quid à nostris Chri-*

*August. de* *stiana charitatis modum votumq. non custodientibus, odiosè*  
*Unitate* *& perniciosè patimini, non esse illos nostros citò dixerim, sed*  
*Ecclesia* *aut futuros, si se correxerint, aut in fine separandos, si in ma-*  
*cap. 17.* *litia perdurauerint. Nos tamen nec propter pisces malos retia*  
*rumpimus, nec propter vasa in contumeliam facta domū ma-*  
*gnam deserimus. Quod si vos quoque illos à quibus talia Ca-*  
*tholica*

*tholica patitur, non esse vestros eadem regula dicitis, probate  
animum vestrum, corrigite errorē, amplectimini unitatem  
spiritus in vinculo pacis.* If it be so that ye suffer any thing  
spitefully done vnto you by them of our side not keping  
the meane and vowe of Christian charitie: I may soone  
say, that they be not of our number, mary but that they  
shalbe, if they amende them selues, or that in the ende  
they shalbe separated from vs, if they continue. How  
so euer it be, yet wil not we for the euil Fisshes sake  
breake the Nettes, neither forsake the great House (that  
is to say, the Church) for their sakes, who be Vessels  
made to dishonour. Now in case ye also, by like rule  
wil say, that they, at whose handes the Catholique  
Church suffereth suche thinges, be not of your side:  
then trie your owne mynde, amend your error, imbrace  
vnitie of sprite in the band of peace.

**Jewel.**

Certainely the holy Fathers, and Martyrs of God vvil say vnto you,  
Vvee knowe not your Priuate Masses: vvee knowe not your Halfe  
Communion: vvee knowe not your Strange Vnknown Praiers: vvee  
knowe not your Adoration of Corruptible Creatures: vvee knowe not  
this Sacrificing of the Sonne of God: vvee knowe not your Nerue Rea-  
ligion: vvee knowe not you. God open the eyes of your Hartes, that ye  
may see the miserable state, ye stande in, and recouer the place, that ye  
haue loste, and finde your Names vvritten in the Booke of Life.

**Harding.**

In the ende of this Diuision by a Rhetorical fici-  
on you make the holy Fathers, and Martyrs of God to  
say vnto vs, as your blasphemous harte doth phontasie.  
But as we feare not that any suche thing by them shal  
be tolde

The holy  
lerned Fa-  
thers tale  
to M. levv  
and his Co-  
panions.

be tolde vs, so were they now lyuing, doubtelesse thus would they saye vnto you, and them of your sectes, as neuerthelesse in their bookes and learned workes, they also doo now in effecte say vnto you daily. We knowe not your strange state, that is without external Sacrifice and Priesthod, and consequently without a Lawe. We knowe not your eating of common bread, and drinking of common wine at your newe founde Suppers, in steede of receiuing the true body and bloude of Christe. We knowe not your Iustification by your special Faith onely. We knowe not your perilous doctrine of Predestination. We knowe not your new manner of baptizing without holy oile, and other auncient rites and Ceremonies. We knowe not your chaungeable new deuised Cōmunions. We knowe not your monstrous Supremacie of Princes in Ecclesiastical maters, that is to say, the keyes of the kingdom of heauen, the supreme Cōmission to feede Christes lambes and shepe, and the whole auctoritie that Christe gaue to S. Peter, and his Successours, so to be vnited by a forced Parliament to the Crowne of a laye Prince, that it be made a mater of inheritaunce, so that the Prince for the time being be head of the Church, and supreme gouernour in al thinges and causes, as wel spiritual as temporal, be it man, or woman, or childe sucking at the Nourfes breste. We condemne your negatiue Diuinitie, which denieth mannes freewil, merites of good workes done in grace, Prayers made to our blessed lady, the Apostles, Martyrs, and other Saintes, to be intercessours for vs to God, Prayers for the dead. We desireste your wicked and incestuous marriages of Priestes, Monkes, Friers, and Non-

nes,

nes, and of al such as haue made solemne vowe to liue without the vse of wedlocke. We deteste your impietie, in that ye refuse to adore and doo godly honour to the body and bloude of your Creator in the Sacrament of the Aulter. We detest your pulling downe of Aulter, your robbing of Churches, your schismes and heresies, and rebellion against your lawful Princes, we detest your prophane contempte of al good religion and godlynes, we detest your wickednes, we detest you.

As for you M. Iewel, I pray God to touche your harte so, as you may be induced rather with some shame of the worlde to recant your heresies, and repent, to saue your soule: then with desperat continuing in that you haue taken vpon you by your foolish and arrogant Challenge, to keepe the vaine estimation of deceiued men, and finally to lose your soule for euer.

The .12. Diuision.

The Answer.

**L**eauing no smal number of places, that might be recited out of diuerse other Doctours, I wil bring two of two woorthy Bishops, one of Chrysostom, the other of S. Ambrose, confirming this Trueth. S. Chrysostomes woordes be these. Pontifex noster ille est, qui hostiam mundantem nos obtulit: ipsam offerimus & nunc, quæ tunc oblata quidem consumi non potest. Hoc autem, quod

Chrysosto.  
in epist. ad  
Heb. homi.

17.

BBB

nos



Ambros.  
In Psal.  
33.

nos facimus, in commemorationem fit eius, quod factum est. Hoc enim facire, inquit, in mei commemorationem. *He is our Bishop, that hath offered vp the Hoste, whiche cleanseth vs. The same doo we offer also nowe, whiche though it were then offered, yet can not be consumed. But this, that we doo, is done in Remembraunce of that, whiche is done. For, doo ye this, saith he, in my Remembraunce.* S. Ambrose saith thus: Vidimus Principem Sacerdotum ad nos venientem: vidimus, & audiuius offerentem pro nobis sanguinem suum: sequamur, vt possumus, sacerdotes, vt offeramus pro populo sacrificium, etsi infirmi merito, tamen honorabiles Sacrificio. Quia etsi Christus non videtur offerre, tamen ipse offertur in terris, quando Christi Corpus offertur. *We haue seene the Prince of Priestes come to vs: we haue seene and hearde him offer for vs his Bloude: Let vs that be Priestes, folow him, as we may, that we may offer Sacrifice for the people, being though weake in merite, yet honourable for the Sacrifice. Because albe it Christe be not seene to offer, yet he is offered in earth, when the Body of Christe is offered. Of these our Lordes woordes, which is geuen for you, and, which is shedde for you, and for many, here S. Ambrose exhorteth the Priestes, to offer the Body*

Body and Bloud of Christe for the people: and willeth them to be more regarded, then comonly they be now a daies, for this Sacrifice sake, though otherwise they be of lesse desert.

*Jewel.*

This allegation argueth no greate abundance of floure. For Chrysostome in these vwoordes bothe openeth him selfe, and shevveth, in vwhat sense other Ancient Fathers vsed this vworde, Sacrifice, and also utterly ouerthroweth M. Hardinges vwhole purpose touching the same. For, as he saithe, wee offer vp the same Sacrifice, that Christe offered, so in most plaine vwise and by sundrie vwoordes, he remouueth al doubt, and declareth, in vwhat sorte, and meaning vwee offer it. He saithe not, as M. Hardinge saithe, wee offer vp the Sone of God vnto his Father, and that verily, and in deede: but contrary vwise thus he saithe, Offerimus quidem, sed ad Recordationem facientes Mortis eius. Hoc Sacrificium Exemplar illius est. Hoc, quod nos facimus, in commemorationem fit eius, quod factum est. Id ipsum semper offerimus: Magis autem Recordationem Sacrificij operamur: VVe offer in deede: but in remembrance of his Death. This Sacrifice, is an Examlpe of that Sacrifice. This, that we doo, is donne in remembrance of that, that was done. VVe offer vp the same, that Christe offered: Or rather wee worcke the Remembrance of that Sacrifice. Thus vwee offer vp Christe, that is to say, an Example, a Commemoration, a Remembrance of the Deathe of Christe. This kinde of Sacrifice vvas neuer denied: but M. Hardinges Real Sacrifice vvas yet neuer proued. So saithe S. Augustine: Cum hostia frangitur, & sanguis in ora Fidelium funditur, quid aliud, quam Dominici Corporis in Cruce Immolatio significatur? VVen the Oblation is broken, and the Bloud (that is to say, The Sacrament of the Bloud) is powred into the mouthes of the Faithful, what other thinge is there signified, but the Sacrifice of Our Lordes Bodye vpon the Crosse?

Chrysost.  
in Epist.  
ad Hebr.  
Hom. 17.

De Con.  
secrat. Di.  
stin. 2. Cū  
frāgitur,

Harding.

How so euer it like you to scorne at our stoare, the multitude of cleare testimonies for proufe of the Sacrifice, to the learned can not be vnknowne. Were it so that ye had but one making so directly against it, as these two here, and sundry others in this Article by me alleged make for it: ye would haue made no smal stoare of it. In bookes and pulpites, in tauernes and alebenches, your trompettes long er this should haue proclaimed it. As for these two places, let vs see, how your slender Replie is farre to light, so to carry away the weight of them.

That  
Priestes  
haue au-  
thoritie  
to offer  
vp Christ  
vnto his  
Father.

An Ar-  
gument for  
the vns-  
learned  
to prooue  
the Sacri-  
fice.

First touching S. Chrysostome, with what plainer termes, with what more effectual wordes could any man haue expressed the truth of our Sacrifice? If we that be Priestes, offer vp now also the selfe same hoste, which our Bishop Christe hath offered vpon the Crosse, euen that hoste which *cleanseth vs from our sinnes*, as S. Chrysostome saith: that being none other but the precious flesh and bloud of Christ, that is to say Christe him selfe (for he offered him selfe to his Father to cleanse vs) how haue not Priestes auctoritie to offer vp Christ vnto his Father, which is the expresse Article that you denye? That euery simple man may haue in readinesse an Argument against such false teachers for the Sacrifice, thus for their sake, it may be framed. Who so euer do offer vp the selfe same hoste, which Christ hath offered, they offer vp Christe. The Priestes offer the same that Christe offered: Ergo they offer vp Christe. The *Maior* is euident in it selfe, the *Minor* is S. Chrysostomes, the Argument being

good, the Conclusion must needs be true.

That it may the better appeare of what force M. Iewels Replie is, this much is to be considered: That in this place of S. Chrysostome consisting of two partes, two thinges are auouched. In the first parte, he geueth vs his witnesse for the substāce of this Sacrifice, which Priestes do now offer in the Church. In the second parte he declareth one ende, wherein the Sacrifice offered by Priestes, doth differ from the Sacrifice offered by Christ him selfe. *Christ our Bishop* (saith he) *offered the cleansing hoste. But we offer that hoste in commemoration.* Which is as much to say, The ende of the Sacrifice that Christe offered, was to cleanse vs from our synnes. The ende of the Sacrifice that is done by Priestes, is to renewe daily the memorie of this cleansing Sacrifice, and so consequently to deriue and apply vnto the deuoute and faithful people, as also vnto them selues, the fruit and effecte of it. The identitie of the substance, of either Sacrifice, and the diuersitie of the ende of either Sacrifice, is plainly taught by S. Chrysostome in that Homilie.

Now let vs examine your Replie. You attribute vnto S. Chrysostome for hauing vttered the saying that I here allege, three thinges. The first is, that *in these wordes* (marke Reader what this man saith) *He openeth him selfe.* The second is, that *he sheweth in what sense other auncient Fathers vsed this worde, Sacrifice.* The third is, that *he ouerthroweth M. Hardings whole purpose touching the Sacrifice.* Surely this is very much, and were it also true, I marvel why neither your selfe, nor any of your felowes euer heretofore alleged it against the Sacrifice. But certaine we are, ye shal wring hard, be-

S. Chrys.  
sometimes  
place ex-  
amined  
with the  
Replie of  
M. levv.

Ad Heb.  
Hom. 17.

In Epist.  
ad Heb.  
Hom. 17.

Three  
thinges  
attribu-  
ted to  
this say-  
ing of S.  
Chrysost.  
by M.  
levv.



fore ye wring this muche out of these wordes.

Hovv S.  
Chryso-  
stom  
openeth him  
selfe  
against  
M. Iewel.

That in these wordes he openeth him selfe, I may easily graunt you. But that opening is openly against your open Sacramentarie heresie. For whereas you denie the oblation and Sacrifice of the Church, he saith, that now also we offer. whereas you denie, that we offer Christe to the Father, he saith, *We offer now also the selfe same hoste, which our high Bishop Christe, hath offered.* And to put it out of doubt, what hoste he meaneth, he openeth him selfe, as you say, calling it, *hostiam mundantem nos*, the hoste that cleanseth vs, which can be none other, but Christe him selfe. And bicause the hostes that were offered in sacrifice in the olde lawe, were forthwith consumed, to shewe the excellencie of this hoste, he saith of it, that being then, that is to say, vpon the Crosse, offered, it can not be consumed. And therefore in the same Homilie he saith, that it is otherwise with vs now, then it was with the Iewes. For they on diuers daies offered diuers lambes. but *We (saith he) offer not one lambe to day, and an other lambe to morowe, but alwaies We offer one, and the same lambe.*

S: Chrys-  
ostom  
returned  
vpon M.  
Iewel.

M. Iew.  
ouerthot  
him selfe  
in alle  
ging this  
place of  
S. Chrys-  
ostom.

Touching the second point, if in these wordes (let them be consideratly perused) S: Chrysostome shewe, in what sense other auncient Fathers haue vsed this woorde, *Sacrifice*, then by the auncient Fathers your doctrine touching the truth of Christes body in the blessed Sacrament, is quite ouerthrowen. For he calleth it most expressely, *the Hoste that cleanseth vs from our sinnes, which Christe our high Bishop offered vp for vs vpon the Crosse.* If the auncient Fathers, when so euer they speake of the hoste that is offered vp by



vp by Priestes in the Sacrifice of the Churche, meane thus, as S. Chrysostome speaketh, then are they of our side by your owne confession, then is the Catholike Doctrine concerning the Sacrament, and the Sacrifice, by them against your heresie confirmed, and mainteined. God be praised, by whose prouidence the Truth is confessed, by the ennemies of Truth. Certainly here you ouerhote your selfe, in telling the truth against your selfe vnwares.

Here then I shal aduertise the Christian Reader, to beare these wordes of S. Chrysostome in memorie, and to consider wel of them, for so much as in them he openeth him selfe, as Mayster Iewel confesseth, and sheweth what meaning the auncient Fathers had, when they spake of the Sacrifice of the Churche.

But how in these wordes he ouerthroweth my purpose touching the Sacrifice, or rather the vniuersal Doctrine of the whole Churche, that neither I, nor M. Iewel him selfe, nor any other man. I am sure, can perceiue. In, these wordes, I say whiche be here alleged in my Answer to the Challenge. Nay, how can they not seme most plainly, and directly to auouche our doctrine touching the Sacrifice? Doth he not set Christe, and Priestes that be now, together in the office of offering? *He hath offered, we offer also now*, saith he. Doth he not auouche the hoste, that Christ offered, and the hoste that Priestes now offer (for thereof he speaketh) to be one, and the selfe same hoste? And that no man should doubt, what hoste he meant, saith he not, *it is that, which cleanseth our sinnes? that, which*  
*then.*

S. Chrysostome  
maketh  
directly  
for the  
real Sac-  
rifice.

Ioan. 1.

*then being offered* (to witte, vpon the Crosse with shedding of bloude, with death, to cleanse synnes, and to redeme the worlde) *can not be consumed?* What hoste can this be, but the body of Christ, but Christe him selfe? For nothing could cleanse our synnes, but he, who onely is *the Lambe of God, that taketh away the synnes of the worlde.* Thus then the substance of the hoste, that Christe our Bishop offered, and of that we offer, is one, and the selfe same. So it is clearly proued by these wordes of S. Chrysostome, that it is not onely a memorie, an example, a similitude, a figure, or resemblance of Christes body, that we offer in our daily Sacrifice, but the selfe same hoste in substance, that Christe offered to cleanse vs, which is the substance of his owne body and bloud, for it was not a figure that he offered for vs, but his true and real bodye.

The ende  
of Christes  
Sacrifice,  
and of  
ours.

But as the substance of his, and our Sacrifice is one, so the ende and effecte by S. Chrysostome in this place, is diuers. He offered him selfe to death to cleanse the synnes of the worlde, to redeme mankind. We offer him in remembrance of that his death, to be partakers of his redemption. But hereof I speake more particularly in my preface before this Roioindre.

S. Chrysostome (say you) *remoueth al doubt, and declareth in what sorte and meaning we offer the Sacrifice.* How so good sir, tel it vs, I pray you, for I accompt it wel worth the learning. Mary (say you) *he saith not, as M. Harding saith, we offer up the Sonne of God vnto his Father, and that verely, and in deede.* First it is a strange thing to me, that a man should remoue al doubt, and declare the certaintie of thinges, by not saying, as you repleye.

repley. Nexte, what if he say not in expresse termes, that we offer vp the Sonne of God vnto his Father? Wil you now go from the mater, and flie for refuge to your owne precise termes?

Consider, I praye you, how this vaine wrangling becommeth the Person of the Great Minister of Sarisburie. Whereas S. Chrysostome saith, that *We offer vp the selfe same Hoste, that Christe our Bishop hath offered, which cleanseth vs from our synnes,* is it not as muche, as if he had said, *We offer vp the Sonne of God?* What hoste is that which cleanseth vs? Is it not Christe onely? Who is Christe? Is he not the Sonne of God? And to whom is Sacrifice done, but to God? Al this set together, how much varieth he from S. Chrysostome, who saith, that we offer vp the Sonne of God vnto his Father? If you sticke to that other worde, *verely, and in deede,* remember, you haue by your translation, made S. Chrysostome in this very place, so to speake your selfe. *We offer in deede,* be the wordes.

M. Jewels  
obiection  
is but a  
vaine  
vvrang-  
gling.

Now that you haue tolde vs, what S. Chrysostome saith not, which helpeth your cause nothing at al: you shewe vs what he saith. And here you bring in certaine peeces, and maimed sayinges out of him, being a fraid to allege the whole sentences, as they lye in that learned Doctour, least you should marre altogether, as you should haue done, if you had suffered him to tel his owne tale. Bicause the place is somewhat long, I had rather referre the Reader vnto the. 17. Homilie vpon the Epistle to the Hebrewes, where it is written, then here to reherse the whole.

CCC

But

M. Iuels  
promise  
vpon S.  
Chrysost.  
howv it is  
pformed

But let vs see, what you pike out of that Homilie for your purpose, and how much it relieueth your cause. Remember what you haue promised to shewe out of S. Chrysostome, *that he remoueth al doubte, and declareth in what sorte and meaning we offer the Sacrifice.* You allege out of the said Homilie, foure sentences, or rather foure peeces of sentences.

Chrysost.  
Hom. 17.  
in epist. ad  
Heb.

The first is this. *Offerimus quidem &c. We offer in deede, but in remembrance of his Death.* These wordes by your interpretation declare in what sorte we offer the Sacrifice. Wel, be it so, I wil not muche contende with you, so that you meane by this sorte, the excluding of the bloody manner of oblatiō. But here I must put the reader in mynde, what foloweth immediatly in that auncient Father. Whiche you haue vnruly conceeled. *Vna est hostia, non multa.* The hoste that we offer (daily, for there he speaketh of the dayly Oblation) is one, it is not many. If it be bread made by the handes of a man, that we offer, and wine pressed out of the grape (for the Real Oblation of the body and bloud of Christe ye denie) albe it the same properly can not be called an Hoste, how can you say, it is one Hoste, that we offer daily, and not many Hostes, seing that euery day we take newe bread, and newe wine for our Sacrifice?

In our Sa-  
crifice vve  
haue the  
sampler,  
and the  
true thing  
it selfe,  
vvhich  
Christe  
offered.

Your second peece of a sentence is this. *Hoc Sacrificium exemplar illius est. This Sacrifice is an example of that Sacrifice.* But what foloweth, *Id ipsum semper offerimus.* We offer alwaies the selfe same thing. And what thing is that? There he sheweth. *It is the Hoste that cleanseth vs, which Christe our Bishop hath offered.* So then we see it called, both the real thing it selfe, that was offered,

offered, and the sampler of the thing. In that he calleth it a sampler, thereby he putteth vs in minde, the order and manner of offering it now, to be different from the manner of the oblation of the Crosse. For there it was bloody, here vnbloody: there with suffering the tourments of death, here with commemoration, representation and application of his death: there the thing offered visible in proper forme, here inuisible, vnder the forme of bread and wine.

Your thirde peece of a sentence taken out of S. Chrysostome, is this. *This that we doo, is done in remembrance of that that was done.* Which wordes declare, the thing that we doo, to be donne in remembrance of the Death of Christe. And they folow immediatly vpon that he said of the *cleansing Hoste*, whiche our Bishop Christe offered, and we also offer the same. So that the difference betwene this, and that, is this. That was the Sacrifice that cleanseth our synnes with his bloude actually shed, and redemed vs by vertue of it selfe. This is the Commemorative Sacrifice, which is offered in commemoration of that, hauing for the substance of it, the same body and bloude of Christe, that was offered vpon the Crosse, by vertue of Consecration made really present, and applieth vnto vs the merite and effecte of the cleansing, and redemption wrought and perfourmed vpon the Crosse.

Then immediatly foloweth the last sentence of the Homilie, a parte whereof you haue taken for your purpose. *Non aliud Sacrificiū, sicut Pontifex, sed idipsum semper offerimus, & c.* We offer not an other Sacrifice, as the Bishop (of the olde lawe did) but alwayes we offer the very



*same that Christe offered, or rather we worke the remembrance of the Sacrifice.* In the Discourse of S Chrysostom, out of whiche M. Iewel hath piked, and culled out certaine peeces, three thinges in effect are declared. First, that we offer, secondly, that our manner of offering is other, then Christes was, therefore ours is called a sampler of that, and it is donne in commemoration of his Death. Thirdly, that the Hoste, or thing offered in either Sacrifice, is one and the same in substance, which is the true body of Christe. Graunt vs the first, and the last, that is to say, that we offer in deede, yea and that the same Hoste, which Christe offered: and to all men of reason and iudgement, though our Sacrifice be a sampler of Christes Sacrifice vpo the Crosse, and though it be done for commemoration of that, shal our Real Sacrifice be sufficiently proued. For what is our endeouour in this Article, but to proue, that we offer vnto God that, which Christe our Bishop hath offered, which is Christe him selfe?

And whereas making vp your *Epiphonema*, you say with more brauarie, then truth, *Thus we offer vp Christe, that is to say, an example, a commemoration, a remembrance of the Death of Christe*: I neuer heard of such a *that is to say*, before, specially if the real presence by these wordes be excluded as your meaning is. O what impudencie is this? Doth not S. Chrysostom by your selfe alleged make a plaine distinction and difference between the hoste offered, and the remembrance, saying, *that which we doo, is done for a commemoration*? Doth it not therby appeare, that somewhat must be done before, and besides the Commemoration? Who euer so confounded thinges, as  
by

Difference  
between  
the hoste  
and the  
commem-  
oration.

as by your absurde and false interpretation you doo, making the body and bloude of Christe, or Christe him selfe, and the remembrance of Christes death, one thing? What, is this your meaning, as though the substance of the Sacrifice, were nothing els, but the remembrance of Christes death? Let this once be graunted, and why may not any man, or woman, make vs as good a Sacrifice at their table at home in their owne howse, as your selfe can at the Communion table in our Ladies Church at Sarisburie? For at that homely table may Christes death be remembred, as wel as at your Communion table.

*This kinde of Sacrifice* (say you speaking of the commemoration of Christes Death) *was neuer denied.* As in a right sense it is very true, and was neuer by vs denied (for the deuoute remembrance of Christes Death by it selfe considered, is a kinde of spiritual Sacrifice) so if you meane thereby to exclude the truth of the thing offered, whiche is the body and bloud of Christe, and serue vs with a shewe, and a remembrance onely distinct from the true thing it selfe that is offered, which seemeth to be your whole drift: this parte of your doctrine we vtterly denie, and tel you, that for maintenance of the same, you vse a fond and vaine reason. For what an Argument is it, when two things be bothe true, by the affirmation of the one, to conclude the denial of the other? As for example, what witte wil allowe this Argument. The Sunne shineth, *Ergo*, it raineth not, or, *Ergo*, it is not colde: whereas many times we see it raine, and seele it colde, when the Sunne shyneth cleare and

M. Ieuvel  
alvvaice  
concludeth  
the denial  
of one  
truth by  
the affirma-  
tion of an  
other  
truth.

bright ? Right so we tel you, and neuer stint telling you (which neuerthelesse ye dissemble to vnderstand) that this your common Argument is naught, the Sacrifice which we offer, is a sampler, or a commemoration of that which Christe offered : Ergo, it is not the same, which Christe offered. For in diuers respectes it is bothe, as now we haue proued by S. Chrysostome.

It is the same in substance, that is to say, the substance of that was offered vpon the Crosse, and of that is offered by Priestes is the Masse, in one, and the same: but it is diuers in the manner of offering. For that was offered bloudily, this vnbloudily in mysterie, and by way of commemoration. So it is the body and Bloud of Christe offered, and also a commemoration of the bloody offering.

The testimonie of S. Augustine (I maruel what you meant to allege it) maketh quite against you. For both it reporteth the real presence, which you denie, and sheweth a difference betwixt the thing which is offered, and Christes Death by the same signified, which you cōfounde. We graunt with S. Augustin, *when the hoste is broken, and the bloude is powred into the mouthes of the faithful, the Sacrificing of our Lordes body is signified.* It is not your false translation of the Oblation, for the holte, nor your Sacramentarie exposition of *the Sacrament of the bloude*, for the bloude, that can racke S. Augustine to the defense of your doctrine. If you grate vpon the worde, *Significatur*, and therefore wil needes haue it to be a signification of Christes Sacrifice : as we denie not the signification, so we require you to acknowledge the real body and bloude of Christe, by breaking whereof  
vnder

De Consec.  
Dicit. 2.  
Cum fran-  
gitur.

vnder the forme of bread, and powring whereof into the mowthes of the faithful vnder the forme of wine, the same signification, and commemoration of Christes Death is made. You handle this place of S. Augustine, as it semeth, as you handled the place of S. Chrysostome before. Sweeping cleane away the hoste, and wying away the bloude, you leaue remaining onely a signification or token. And thus you feede your people with signes and tokens, in steede of the most holesome and substantiall meate and drinke.

Thus haue you not weakened the strength of S. Chrysostomes testimonie by your feeble answer, thus it remaineth stil in good force against your Challenge, thus by your slender Replie you haue geuen al men occasion to thinke, how good and sufficient our Stoare is for the proufe of the external Sacrifice of the body and bloud of Christe, in scoffing whereat you take so much pleasure. It remaineth that we trie, of what substance and pith your Replie is, to the place by me alleged out of S. Ambros.

Jewel.

Euen so S. Ambrose saith, Christe is offered here in the Earth (not Re- Ambrosi- ally, and in deede, as M. Hardinge saith) but in like sorte, and sense, in Psal. 38. as S. Iohn saith, The Lamme was slaine from the beginning of Apocal. 5. the worlde: that is, not Substantially, or in Real manner, but in signification, in a Myserie, and in a figure. And thus S. Ambrose expoundeth his owne meaning, euen in the same place, that is here alleged. Primū Vm- Ambrosi- bra præcessit: Secuta est Imago: Erit Veritas. Vmbra in lege: Psalm. 38. Imago in Euangelio: Veritas in Cœlestibus. Ascende homo in cœlum, & videbis illa, quorum hic Vmbra erat, vel Imago. First the Shadowe wente before; The Image folowed; The Trueth shall be:

ſhalbe. The Shadowe in the Lawe : The Image in the Goſpel :  
 The Trueth in the Heauens , O Man ,goe vp into Heauen : and  
 thou ſhalte ſee thoſe thinges , whereof here was an Image , and  
 a ſhadowe. *To like purpoſe S. Ambroſe writeth thus: Vidimus eum,*  
*in Lucam. lib. 5. ca. 7* & oculis noſtris perſpeximus , & in veſtigia clauorum eius digi-  
 tos noſtros inſeruimus . Videmur enim vidiffe eum , quem legi-  
 mus : ſpectaſſe pendentem , & vulnera eius Spiritu Eccleſiæ ſcu-  
 tante tentaſſe : wee haue ſeene him and lookte vpon him , with  
 our eies : and wee haue thruſt our fingers into the dentes of his  
 nayles . *The reaſon hereof is this :* For wee ſeeme to ſee him , that  
 wee reade of : to haue beholden him hanginge on the Croſſe :  
*Hieron. in* and with the feelinge Sprite of the Church to haue ſearched his  
*Pſalm. 86.* woundes . So S. Hierome ſaith , Quod ſemel natum eſt ex Ma-  
 ria , quotidie in nobis naſcitur : Chriſte that was once borne of  
 Marie , is borne in vs euery daie. *Nowe as S. Ambroſe ſaith , VVee*  
*ſee Chriſte euen with our eies hanginge vpon the Croſſe : and*  
*thruſte in our fingers , and ſearche his woundes: Euen ſo , doo wee*  
*ſee Chriſte Comminge vnto vs , and Offeringe him ſelfe in Sacrifice vnto*  
*God, And as S. Hierome ſaith , Chriſte is Borne euery day , Euen ſo ,*  
*and none otherwiſe , S. Ambroſe ſaith , Chriſte is Sacrificed euery*  
*daie. In like manner S. Ambroſe writeth vnto certaine Virgins : Ve-*  
*Ambroſe* ſtras Mentis confidenter Altaria dixerim , in quibus quotidie pro  
*de Virgi-*  
*nib. lib. 2.* Redemptione Corporis Chriſtus offertur : I maie boldly ſaie ,  
 Your hartes be Aultars , vpon whiche Hartes Chriſte is dayly  
 offered for the Redemption of the Bodie. *Hierbeto M. Hardinge*  
*both ſounde no manner token of that , he ſought for.*

Harding.

This *Euen ſo* (if I may be ſo bolde with you , as to viſe  
 a homely prouerbe ) is as euen , as a rammes horne . And  
 Sir , is this place of S. Ambroſe ſo ſoone answered ? Is it  
 ynough for you to ſay as you doo , and proue nothing ?  
 Is it



Is it lawful for you to say what you list, and denie what you list, without any proufe at al? And if ye stand so al waies in your Negatiues, what a coomber shal it be vnto vs, to proue any neuer so certaine a truth to such a wrangler? How oftentimes haue you now said, that Christe is none otherwise offered in earth, then he was offered in the Sacrifices of Abel, of Abraham, or of them of the olde Testament? And al this vppon warrant of this saying of S. Iohn, *The lambe was slaine from the beginning of the worlde*, which maketh nothing against the daily Sacrifice of the Church? How sufficiently, and by how many authorities hath this Sacrifice bene prooued? Yet forth you go, as if nothing had ben said.

If our Sacrifice of the body and bloud of Christ in the Sacrament be not real, and substantial, but only figuratiue and signifiatiue, as you say: then how be our Mysteries of more excellencie, then the Iewes Sacramentes were? Nay how do not the liue beastes, which they sacrificed, passe a dead peece of breade, for better ye esteeme it not? If our Sacrifice be no better then their Sacrifices were, then is our Priestthod of the new Testamēt no better then their Priestthode was. If our Priestthod be no better, then is the Lawe of the Gospel, wherein we liue, no better then the olde Lawe of Moyles was, vnder which the Iewes lyued. For these three, Sacrifice, Priestthod, and Lawe be so proportionate together, be so of cousinage, and alwaies go so together by the doctrine of S. Paule as you knowe; that the bettering of either of them, doth inferre the bettering of the other. Nowe let the Christian reader make his choise, whether he wil beleue the whole Church of Christe, and S. Ambrose,

*Apost. 9.*

If our Mysteries be excellentier then the Sacrifices of the old Law, then are they not signifiatiue only.

*Heb. 7.*

identical word but a different one

*Ambro. in Psal. 38.*

D D D

or you,

or you. He saith, *Christe is offered on the earth, when the body of Christe is offered*: you say. Neither Christ, nor the body of Christ is offered on the earth, but al that is done, is but a token, and a figure.

Here were it to good purpose, to proue the truth of the body and bloud of Christ in the Sacramēt, for els we labour in vaine, a wrangling and contentious witte euer finding thifres by running alwaies to his Negatiues. But bicause that Article hath ben already proued, partly by me in my Answer to your Challenge, and more amply by Doctor Heskens, and Doctor Saunder, as also by sundry other learned and worthy men, before you and your companions rushed into the Church by the window: I mynd not to enter into that large feelde now, nor think it nedeful to do that is wel done already. That point then being cleare by Gods worde, and besides substantially proued, determined by the Church in General Councils according to the Scriptures, beleued euer of al Christian and faithfull people, and graunted by the Fathers of your religion the Lutherans: let vs consider of that you bring against the Sacrifice auouched by S. Ambrose.

Image,  
vyhat it  
signifieth  
and how  
it exclu-  
deth not  
the truth,

As touching your other place of S. Ambrose, where by you would seme to expounde the former by me alleged, it maketh for the Sacrifice, it maketh nothing against the Sacrifice. Neither can you take any aduantage of the worde, *Imago, Image*. For by that worde the truth is not excluded, but signified, yet so, as thereby we be admonished, that we beholde thinges more obscurely here, then we shal beholde them in heauē, and that the thinges here be but an Image, in cōparison of the true thinges in heauē. The truth is here, no lesse then in heauē. But bicause it

is not

is not so truly sene here, as there, therefore S. Ambros cō-  
sidering the diuerse degree of our knowledge, calleth in  
sundry places (accordig to S. Paule writig to the Hebrues)  
the state here an Image, and the state there, the truth.

Ambro. li.  
1. officiorū  
cap. 48. In  
Psal. 38.  
Heb. 10.

And if we may expounde S. Ambrose by S. Ambrose,  
he sheweth his meaning clearly in an other place. Which  
is, by the terme, *Image*, in respect of the state of the Gos-  
pel, not to exclude the Truth of thinges, but to insinuat  
an obscurer manner of exhibeting the truth in compari-  
son of the state of heauen. His wordes be these. *Ecclesia*  
*est imago cœlestiū, etenim postquā umbra praterijt, imago*  
*succesit. Umbra, synagoga est. In umbra lex, in Euangelio ve-*  
*ritas.* The Church is an image of heauen (or of heavenly  
thinges) for after that the shadowe was gone away, the  
Image succeded. The shadow, is the Synagogue. In the  
shadowe was the Lawe, in the Gospel is the Truth. Lo  
wheras he said in the place by you alleged, *the image is in*  
*the Gospel*, here expounding his minde more plainely, he  
saith, *in the Gospel is Truth*, calling that *Truth*, here, which  
he called *Image*, there.

Ambro. de  
interpel-  
latione  
David.

But sir with what face, I say not with what cōscience,  
durst you so fowly in translating this place of S. Ambrose  
to falsifie his wordes and sence? Why did you trāspose his  
wordes, setting the former word in the second place? and  
why did you turne, *and, for, or*? The later sentence truly  
translated is this. *O man, go vp into heauen, and thou shalt*  
*see those thinges, whereof here was a shadow, or an Image.*  
Which last wordes you falsified thus, *whereof here was*  
*an Image and a shadowe.*

M. Ievvel  
falsifieth  
S. Ambro-  
se.

By this chopping and chaunging of woordes, your e-  
uill intent was, to bring your reader in beleefe, that the

Sacramentes of the olde Law be of equal worthines with the Sacramentes of the newe Lawe. By your sclender Replie, and by such false legierdemaine, I'doubte not but the wiser sorte wil be moued to trie your strange doctrine better, then heretofore of many it hath ben tryed, before they beleene it.

M. Iewell  
confounds  
deith one  
truth  
with an  
other  
truth.  
Lib. 9.  
Cammēt.  
in Luc.  
cap. 7.

From this place to the ende of the Diuision, this Replier doth nothing els, but endeuour to confound thinges, that in them selues be distinct, that so at least he might cast some myste as it were before the readers eyes. As for example, bicause the reading of the storie of the Gospel sheweth vnto our vnderstāding and faith, Christ hanging vpon the Crosse, as S. Ambrose saith, his syde opened with the souldiours speare, his handes and feete pearced through with the nayles, and the Sacrament also of Christes body and bloud, doth represent and commend vnto our memories the same:

Hieron. in  
Psal. 86.

Againe, bicause *Christe* being *virtus Patris*, the vertue of his Father, is borne in vs euery daye, when any vertue is wrought by vs, as S. Hierome saith: Therefore (by this mannes Logique) *Christe* is not really, but by a similitude or figure only sacrificed of Priestes euery day. Furthermore, bicause the myndes of holy virgins be meete Altars for Christ daily to be offered vpon (to wit, by daily

Ambro. de  
Virginib.  
lib. 2.

meditation of his Passion) as S. Ambrose sticketh not to say: therefore *Christe* is no more really present vpon the real Altars of the Church, when the Sacrifice of his body and bloude is offered by the Priest, then he is in the mynde of a pure and holy virgine deuoutly thinking of his death. Seme not these reasons to procede from a profounde Diuinitie? What is this, but to confounde

one



one truth with an other truth, and to vndoo all proper speeches, by figuratiue and metaphorical Phrases? He should haue remembred, that euen they of his owne side doo teache, that we ought not to ronne vnto tropes for the vnderstanding of any point, onlesse there felowe a great absurditie, if the wordes be taken in their proper signification.

That this myste of M. Jewels confusion be discussed and put a waye, who is so vnskillful in maters of our faith, that putteth not a manifest difference between the setting forth of Christes death vnto our vnderstanding by reading the Scriptures, and the representation and commemoration of the same vnto our faith by the Sacrament of his body and bloude? In that a Description only by wordes is made of the order and manner of putting Christ to death, whereby an Image thereof is imprinted in our vnderstanding and memorie. In this the body of Christe, that was put to death, is present, layd before vs according to his worde, *This is my body which is geuen for you*. That is a general meane to come to the knowledge of Christes death. This is a special meane to remember his death. That is common vnto the Infidel reading the storie of the Gospel, as wel as vnto the faithfull. This is proper to the true Christiā geuing credit to Gods worde. That may be conueniently reade by euery priuate man at al times, and in al places. This can not duely be consecrate and ministred, but by a Priest lawfully ordered, and that in time and place appointed. That may be read by a wicked man without increafe of his sinne. This can not be consecrate nor receiued of any being in deadly sinne without increafe of his farther damnation. This

The difference of Christes being in the sacrifice, and in the reading of the storie of the Gospel.

LUC. 22.



is, and euer hath bene by the Church called and taken for the very body and bloud of Christe. That neither is, nor euer hath ben commonly so called or taken. This is a Sacrament, and the Sacrifice of the new Lawe. That is neither of them both. Finally, that feedeth the vnderstanding onely. This is the foode both of soule, and body to life euerlasting. These differences being so apparent, so greate, and of such importance, who can otherwise iudge, but that Christes presence in the Sacrifice of the Church, must be after a more substantial and real manner, then in the letter of the Gospel, or in the reading thereof?

Moreouer if he be present in the Sacrament and Sacrifice, none otherwise then he is at the reading of the Gospel, then is the Sacrifice and Sacrament superfluous. For to stirre vp in our myndes the remembrance of Christes Death, it should suffice to reade, or to heare readen daily the storie of the Passion without any celebration of the Sacrament. But Christe knowing the dulnesse of our hartes to be such, that woordes be not sufficient to repaire our memorie, and to stirre vp our affection without the presence of some thing of more Maiestie then woordes be, of his tender loue leasse to his dere spouse the Church besides his Gospel, a thing of most excellent Maiestie, his owne flesh and bloude: that we being assured through faith of his real presence in our Mysteries, should more dreadfully reuerence him, more expressely remember him, more affectuously loue him, and by the worthy receiuing of it, be made partakers of the fruit of his Passion. Of this presence, and of this great fruit, would M. Iewel with al his lewde harte bereue

M. Iewel  
acknowv  
ledgeth  
Christes  
presence  
in the  
Bless. Sa-  
crament  
no other,  
vvise the  
in the stor-  
ie of the  
Gospel,  
vvhen it  
is read  
and heard.

bereue vs, by making Christe present in the Mysteries none otherwise, then he is at the reading of the storie of the Gospel, that is to say, onely by the comprehension of our vnderstanding and by faith: And that he is as truly now hanging vpon the Crosse, when we reade the storie of his passion, and do by the eyes our of Imagination beholde him hanging, as he doth sacrifice himselfe, when his body is sacrificed, as S. Ambrose before alleged, speaketh.

Touching the right vnderstanding of this place of S. Ambrose, we see Christe hanging vpon the Crosse, and thrust our fingers into the dentes of his nayles, two waies. either by faith, or by charitie. Faith hath eyes to see, and fingers to feele. But what manner eyes, and fingers? Spiritual. Through faith we see Christe hanging vpon the Crosse, and feele his woundes. That is to say, The benefite of his Passion through the merite of faith is imparted vnto vs nolesse, then if we behelde him with our eyes hanging vpon the Crosse, and with our fingers touched his woundes. Of them that haue this faith our Lorde saith in the Gospel, *Beati qui non viderunt, & crediderunt*. Blessed by they, that haue not sene (with bodily eyes) and beleeue. Neither saith S. Ambrose plainly, *that we see Christe with our eyes hanging vpon the Crosse, and that we thrust in our fingers, and searche his woundes,* as to your aduantage you report him: but correcting him selfe, he saith, *Videmur vidisse eum &c.* We seeme to haue scene him, and with the searching sprite of the Churche to haue groped his woundes. He attributeth al to the spirite, which through faith seeth, and feeleth.

By charitie we behold Christ hanging vpon the Crosse, and

VVe see  
Christ hanging  
on the Crosse  
and grope  
his woundes,  
vnto  
vvaies.  
How  
vve see  
the woundes  
of  
Christ by  
faith.

Ioan. 20.

Ambros.

In Luc.

lib. 5. c. 7.

Hovv  
vve ſee  
Chriſt ſuf-  
fering, by  
Charitie.

and thruſt our fingers into his woundes, bicauſe through  
charitie we are in that body of Chriſte, to witte the  
Church, which ſeeth Chriſte ſo hanging, and thruſteth  
the fingers into his woundes. For what grace, vertue,  
miracle, or other excellencie ſo euer is in the Body of  
the Church, through the merite of charitie, which  
cauſeth participation of al good thinges to be common,  
euery one that is of that body, may ſay, that he hath the  
ſame. In conſideration whereof S. Auguſtine ſaith no-  
tably: *If any wil ſay to one of vs, thou haſt receiued the  
holy Ghoſt, why ſpeakeſt not with al tongues? He ought to  
Answer, I ſpeake with al tongues, bicauſe I am in that body  
of Chriſte, in the Church, which ſpeaketh with al tongues.*

Augu. ſer-  
mone. 188  
De tem-  
pore.

Hovv  
ſpeaketh  
the Chur-  
che with  
al tongues.

Augu. ſer-  
mone. 186.  
De Tem-  
pore.

Guerricus  
abbas Iga-  
niacensis.  
Sermo, in  
die Purifi-  
cat-inter  
opera Ber-  
nardi.

1. Ioan. 1.

The Chur-  
che be-  
holdeth  
Chriſt,  
and tous-  
cheth his  
woundes.

But how may it be vnderſtanded, that the Church  
ſpeaketh with al tongues? In aſmuch as ſome of the  
Church doo ſpeake with al tongues. Therefore in an o-  
ther place he ſaith. *In ſome Saintes the Church marketh  
Miracles, in other Saintes it ſpeaketh the truth, in other  
Saintes it kepeth virginittie, in other Saintes it kepeth the  
chattiſe of wedlocke, in others this, in others that. Cer-  
taine vertues (ſaith a holy Father) though al perſons haue  
not yet let them loſe him, who hath that, which they finde  
not in themſelues, and then haue they in him that, which  
in themſelues they ſee not, as Peter in Iohn hath the merite  
of virginittie, ſo Iohn in Peter hath the reward of Mar-  
tyrdom.*

In whom then doth the Church ſee Chriſte han-  
ging vpon the Croſſe, and feele his woundes? In S. Iohn  
the Church ſeeth him, who ſaith, *That which was from  
the beginning, we haue heard, we haue ſene with our eyes,  
and our bandes haue touched, &c.* In the Apoſtles it behol-  
deth

deth with eyes Christe vpon the Crosse, in S. Thomas it toucheth his woundes. That this seeme not strange, euen so saith S. Ambrose in the booke and chapter aboute mentioned. *Sed etiam nos vidimus in Iohanne, oculis nostris perspeximus in Apostolis, & manibus nostris perscrutati sumus in Thoma digitis.* Yea we also haue seene Christe in Iohn, with our eyes we haue beholden him in the Apostles, and with our handes we haue serched his woundes in the fingers of Thomas.

Ambros:  
in Lucam.  
lib. 5. c. 37

Now if this body the Church, and consequently euery one that is a member of this body, see Christe hanging vpon the Crosse, and with the fingers touche his woundes, either bicause he hath the light and sight of faith, or bicause through Charitie he is incorporate and made a member of that body, and so seeth and toucheth by participation what maketh this against the real Sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, frequented in the Church? Bicause this manner of seeing Christe, and of touching his woundes, whether it be through vertue of faith, or merite of charitie, is not real and in dede, wil you therof gather an Argumēt, that Christ in the Sacrifice of the Church is not really offered? O that you would make this Argument in Louaine, or Paris, or in any other famous Schoole of Diuinitie in the worlde, this Argument I say, Christe is not now seene hanging vpon the Crosse, neither be his woundes touched really and in dede: Ergo, he is not of the Priestes offered vp in the Mysteries really:

You may besure the Audience with hissing, and trampling would drine you out of the Schoole.

If you say, I doo you wrong in reporting your Argument to

EEE



ment to disaduantage, which is your cōmon practise to-  
wardes me: I am content you frame it to your best aduā-  
tage. Let your owne Argument stand, as your selfe haue  
set it forth. An Argument I may cal it, for by your *Maior*,  
any man may sone vnderstād, what should be your *Minor*,  
and conclusion. Your Argument then is this. *As we see*  
*Christ enē with our eyes hanging vpon the Crosse, and thrust*  
*in our fingers, and searche his woundes: Euen so doo we see*  
*Christ comming vnto vs, and offering him selfe in Sacrifice*  
*vnto God.* Your *Minor*, or secōd proposition, must be this.  
but really and in deede so we see not Christ, neither doo  
we so with our fingers searche his woundes: *Ergo*, really  
and in deede we see not Christe comming vnto vs, and  
offering him selfe in Sacrifice.

Why fir al this I graunt. For in deede we see not now  
Christe comming vnto vs, nor offering him selfe: But  
our controuerſie is not of seing Christ comming, and of-  
fering him selfe: but of the offering of his body in Sacri-  
fice. And to that I alleged S. Ambrose, saying, *Etsi Chri-*  
*stus non videtur offerre, tamen ipse offertur in terris, quan-*  
*do Christi corpus offertur.* Although Christ be not seene to  
offer, yet him selfe is offered in the earth, when the bo-  
dy of Christ is offered. Lo he saith expressly, he is not  
seene to offer, and yet he is offered: Your parte is to im-  
pugne the offering, and bicause you cannot, you impugne  
the seing of him cōming and offering him selfe. We see  
him not, and yet he is offered in earth, as S. Ambrose saith.

Now then, whereas you are driuen from this, if thus  
you make your Argument, as in effecte you doo, and as  
your fetch is to conclude:

*As Christ is seene of vs hanging vpon the Crosse, and*  
*as his*



as his woundes be touched with our fingers, so he is by Priests offred, but he is not sene hāging vpo the Crosse really and in dede, nor his woundes be so touched with our fingers: *Ergo*, he is not offered really and in dede: As I graunt the Argument to be good in forme, so I denie the mater to be true. For the *Mayor*, or first proposition is false. For Christes hanging on the Crosse, and the print of his woundes, is seene, and felt of vs by faith, or by charitie, as I haue now declared: but Christe is offered vp in Sacrifice really, and in dede, bicause his body is really and in dede present in the Sacrament, as it hath bene against you. M. Iewel by the Catholikes most sufficiently prooued by scriptures, Fathers, and the faith of the Church, and as you knowe in your owne gilty conscience.

The saying which you attribute vnto S. Hierom, *Quod semel natū est ex Maria, quotidie in nobis nascitur*, Christe that was once borne of Marie, is borne in vs euery day: is an inuention of your owne. S. Hierom hath it not, you may sone fil your booke with such authorities, being made at home in your owne forge. S. Hierome expounding an obscure place of the. 86. Psalme tropologically, saith this much, I grant, *Si volumus, quotidie nascitur Christus*. If we wil, Christ is borne daily. There he calleth the doing of euery vertue, the begeting and bringing forth of Christe, bicause Christ is the vertue and wisdom of his Father. But what maketh this saying against the real Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe? By occasion of these wordes, you reason thus, as it may be conceiued.

As S. Hierom saith, Christ is borne euery day, Euen so ad none otherwise, S. Ambros saith, Christ is sacrificed euery day. But Christe is not borne euery day really,

M. Iewel  
forgeth  
vvordes  
of his  
owne ad  
attribu  
teth them  
to S.  
Hierom.  
Hierony.  
in Psal. 86

*Ergo*, S. Ambrose meaneth not; that he is sacrificed e-  
uery day really.

Answer. Your *Maior* is false. For there is a manifest dis-  
similitude between the partes compared together. When  
we bring forth good vertues, and Christe therefore is said  
to be borne in vs: this is spoken by a Metaphore, and is  
true onely in a tropological, or morale sense, and not in  
the literal sense. The other parte of the comparison,  
*Christ is offered euery day, when his body is offered*; as S. Am-  
brose saith, is a proper speache, and the same is true in the  
literal sense, as now we haue prooued.

Lastly, that I let not passe the other place of S. Am-  
brose, where he calleth the myndes of holy virgins, Aul-  
ters: the reason you gather thereof is naught. For of the  
affirmation of an internal Sacrifice, you inferre the de-  
nial of the external Sacrifice, and so you would driue  
out one truth by an other truth, after your common  
wount. Which kinde of reasoning is very fonde and  
childish. For both may, and ought to stand together.  
Your Argument, if you conclude ought, must be this:

*Ambrosi-  
de Virgi-  
nib. lib. 2.  
M. Iewels  
peculiar  
Sophis-  
trie to  
put away  
one truth  
by an o-  
ther.*

Christe is offered in the myndes of virgins, which  
therefore may be called Aulters, internally; and spiri-  
tually: *Ergo*, he is not offered on the true Aulters in  
the Churche externally, and really.

The Argument is naught, as euery yong Sophister know-  
eth, bicause he is offered both waies. As wel you might  
reason thus, Christ is God, *Ergo*, he is not man: or contri-  
rywise, Christe is man, *ergo*, he is not God.

Thus thou mayst easily perceiue good Reader, what  
guileful Sophistrie M. Iewel useth, putting away the vi-  
sible and outwarde Sacrifice of the Churche, by alle-  
ging

ging places of Fathers, commending vnto vs, the inward and mere spiritual Sacrifices of mannes harte. Withal thou seest also, what so euer M. Iewel saith, that I haue founde in S. Chrysostome, and S. Ambrose, that I sought for.

The. 13. Diuision

The Answer.

**N**Owe for proufe of the Sacrifice, and Oblation of Christe by the Doctours mynde vpon the figure of Melchisedech: First S. Cyprian saith thus.

Lib. 2.  
Epist. 3.

Qui magis Sacerdos Dei summi, quam Dominus noster Iesus Christus, qui Sacrificium Deo patri obtulit, & obtulit hoc idem, quod Melchisedech, id est, Panem & Vinum, suum, scilicet, Corpus, & Sanguine. Who is more the Priest of the highest God, then our Lorde Iesus Christe, who offered a Sacrifice to God the Father, and offered the selfe same, that Melchisedech did, that is, Breaade and Wine, that is to say, his owne body and Bloude? S. Hierome in an epistle, that he wrote for the vertuouse women Paula, and Eustochium to Marcella, hath these wordes: Recurre ad Genesim, & Melchisedech Regem Salem: Huius Principem inuenies ciuitatis, qui iam in typo Christi Panem, & Vinum obtulit, & Mysterium Christianum in Saluatoris sanguine, & corpore de-

dicatit. Retourne to the Booke of Genesis, and to Melchisedek the King of Salem. And thou shalt finde the Prince of that Citie, who euen at that time in the figure of Christe offered Breade and Wine, and dedicated the Mysterie of Christians in the Body, and Bloude of our Sauour. Here this learned Father maketh a plaine distinction betwene the Oblation of the Figure, which was Breade and Wine, and the Oblation of the Trueth, which is the Mysterie of Christen people, the Bloude and Body of Christe our Sauour. Of this S. Augustine speaketh largely in his first Sermon vpon the .33. Psalme, and in the .17. booke De Ciuitate Dei, cap. 20.

Cyprianus  
Lib. 2.  
Epist. 3.

As M. Harding weane plainly, and vvil haue S. Cyprians vvordes taken as they lie, without Figure, then must he say, That Melchidek offered vp verily, and Really, Christ him selfe. For S. Cyprians vvordes be cleare, Christus obtulit hoc idem, quod Melchisedek obtulerat. Christ offered vp the same thing, that Melchisedek had offered.

Sir I assure you I meane plainly, would God you did so too. verily if you did, we should not thus finde you alwaies starting a side, to figures, and phraes. Following my prefixed order, in my Answer I come now to, proue the Sacrifice by the witnessse of two auncient Fathers, S. Cyprian, and S. Hierome, alleging for it, the figure of Melchisedek. First touching S. Cyprian, let his wordes be taken as they lie, without figure, folde, or wrinkle: how therof



therof will it folow, that Melchisedek offered verely, and really Christ him selfe? For (say you) *S. Cyprians wordes be cleare: Christ offered the same thinge, that Melchisedek had offered.* The clearer the wordes be, the lesse they serue your obscure purpose.

If we graunted your translation to be true, who haue turned, *hoc idem, the same thing*, where it ought rather to be turned, *the same* (Sacrifice) being referred to Sacrifice, that goeth there before immediatly, If we wincked at you for this, I say: Yet I pray you, how foloweth this Argument, *Christ offered the same thing that Melchisedek had offered, Ergo Melchisedek offered up Christ him selfe verely and really?* If you would haue gonne the right way to worke, thus you should haue argued. Christe offered the same thing, that Melchisedek had offered: Melchisedek had offered bread and wine, *Ergo*, Christe offered bread and wine. But bicause, if you had thus rightly framed your Argument, you had concluded with vs against your selfe by *S. Cyprian*, by whose interpretation the bread and wine, that Christ offered, was his body and bloud: rather then you would graunt so much, it liked you better to vse false Logique, then true Diuinitie.

The wordes then of *S. Cyprian* taken in their plaine and litteral sense, and without any figure doo signifie, that Melchisedek offered bread and wine, as much to say, a bare figure: and that Christe fulfilling that Figure, offered also bread and wine. But what bread and wine? His body and bloude, the true bread, and the true wine. Which body and bloude, bicause they feede and susteine both body and soule to life euerlasting, the comon bread and wine that Melchisedek offered, hauing vertue to feede

Christe offered the true bread and true wine at his Supper.



The Sac-  
crifice of  
Melchise-  
dek, and  
the Sacri-  
fice of,  
Christe,  
both di-  
uers, and  
the same.

to feede only the body, and that but for a final time : are  
for good cause called the true bread and wine.

But perhaps you sticke to the worde, *hoc idē, the same*  
*Sacrifice, or, the same thing*, if you wil needes haue it so.  
If Christe offered the same, say you, whereas Melchise-  
dek offered, but bread and wine, how offered Christe him-  
selfe truly and really? True it is, the Sacrifice of either,  
or the thing, that either of them offered, is both di-  
uers, and also the same. How diuers? And howe the  
same? Diuers in substance, the same in Mysterie. The  
diuersitie of substance not only S. Cyprian in the Epistle  
to Cecilius, but also S. Hierome confesseth, writing vpo

Hierony. the. 109. Psalme. *Quomodo Melchisedech obtulit panem &*  
*in Psal. 109 vinum, sic & tu offeres corpus tuum & sanguinem, verum*  
*panem, & veram vinū.* Like as Melchisedek offered bread  
and wine: so thou shalt offer thy body and bloud, the true  
bread, and the true wine. What difference then and di-  
uersitie is between the figure, and the thing forefigured,  
that is to say, betwen Melchisedeks bread and wine, and  
the body and bloud of Christe: such diuersitie of substance  
is there in the thinges which they offered.

• That Christe offered the same, that Melchisedek had  
offered, for the vnderstanding of it, it may be said, both in  
consideration of the Mysterie, and of the thing it selfe in  
a right sense, either bicause the formes of bread and wine  
remained after consecration, or bicause it was bread and  
wine in dede before Christ had consecrated and offered.

Ioan. 2.

We read in the Gospel, that when our Sauour at the Ma-  
riage had turned water into wine, he commaunded the  
waiters to draw, and bring it vnto the Vsher of the Haul.  
They brought it, and the Vsher tasted water made wine.

Now

Now true it is to saye, that the waiters did drawe, and bring, and the Vſher taſted the ſame thing, that the waiters had filled the waterpottes withal a litle before, that is, water. But what water? Forſooth water made wine. Likewise it was truly ſaid of S. Cyprian, that Chriſte offered the ſame thing, that Melchizedech had offered before him, that is, bread and wine. But what bread and wine? Forſooth bread and wine made his body and bloude. So the Scripture ſaith, that Aarons Rodde deuoured the Roddes of the Enchaunters. What rodde was that? It was the Rodde made a ſerpent. By this it appeareth, how ſclender your Argument is, which here you gather againſt the Real Sacrifice out of S. Cyprians wordes, and how you ſeeke not ſo much the truth, as to gaineſay, and ouerthwarte the Authorities, that for the ſame I alleged. Let vs examine the reſt of your Replie.

Exod. 7.

*Jewel.*

*Notwithſtanding it is certaine, that the Sacrifice, that Melchizedek made, if it were graunted to be a Sacrifice, yet in plaine, and Common manner of ſpeache, was not Chriſte the Sonne of God, but onely material Breade, and Wine, and other like prouiſion of Viſualles prepared for Abraham, and for his menne. And therefore the Olde learned Fathers ſaie not, Melchizedek offered the ſame in Sacrifice vnto God: but He brought it forth, as a preſent, as the manner was, to reſreaiſhe them, after the purſuite, and chaſe of their enimies. And S. Hierome in his Translation turneth it not, Oblulit, He Sacrificed: but, Protulit, He brought it forth. Iosephus reporteth the mater thus: Melchizedek milites Abrahami hospitaliter habuit, nihil illis ad victum deesse Paſſus: Simulque ipſum adhibuit Meſſe: Melchizedek feaſted Abrahams Souldiers, and ſuffered them to wante nothinge, that was neceſſary for their prouiſion: And*

*Ioseph. An  
tiquit. lib.  
1. cap. 21.*

*Chrysost. in* likewise he receiued Abraham him selfe vnto his Table. *Chrysost. Gene. Ho-* same, and *Epiphanius* say thus, He brought forth vnto them *mil. 35.* Breade and V Vine. *Tertullian* saith, Abrahamo reuertenti de *Epiph. cōt.* praelio obtulit Panem & Vinum: Melchisedek offered Breade, *Melc. lib. 2* and V Vine (not vnto God, but) vnto Abraham returninge from *Εξελθεν* the fighte, So *S. Ambrose*, Occurrit Melchisedek, & obtulit Abra- *αυτες αρ-* hamo Panem, & Vinum: Melchisedek came forth to meete, and *των κ. δ. ι-* offered (not vnto God, but) vnto Abraham Breade, and V Vine. *μον.* By these seve it may appeare, that Melchisedek brought forth the Bread, *Tertull. cō-* and V Vine, and other prouision, not as a Sacrifice vnto God, but as a Re- *α. Iudeos.* lief, and susteinance for Abraham, and for his Companie.

Harding.

It is a worlde to see your doublenes. What, are ye not resoluēd, whether the Sacrifice that Melchisedek made, were a Sacrifice, or no? Sir, the Sacrifice he made, that is to say, the thing which he offered in Sacrifice, was not Christe the Sonne of God, pardy. Who euer said, it was? Wel, what was it then? Mary, onely material bread, and wine, say you. So say we too. and, that by the same, the Sacrifice of Christes body and bloud vnder the forme of bread and wine, was forefigured. But was this al that Melchisedek offered? Not al, by you. For you reckon vp also the prouision of victuals, that were prepared for Abraham, and his men, that were in number. 318. Then of likelyhod this was a ioyly Sacrifice. For Melchisedek being a King, as he was, like it is, that he prouided biese, veale, and mutton, pigge, goose and capen, baakte, boiled, and roste. For such victuals are mete for the prouision of an Armie. And did Melchisedek sacrifice al these thinges? This is more, then euer I read, or heard of before, or you either, I am bold to say. For your credites sake you should haue

What  
was Mel  
chisedeks  
Sacrifice  
by M. Jew

haue alleged but one Doct̃or of good fame, olde, or new,  
that so writeth. Bicause ye haue none to allege, we take  
it for a forgerie of your owne shoppe; set out to thinc̃t  
bread and wine only named, should nor represent to the  
memorie of men the body and bloud of Christe, where-  
of the bread and wine were figures. Verely Eusebius  
writeth *lib. 5. De Demonstrat.* that he neuer offered body-  
ly Sacrifices, that is to say, thinges that had liuing bo-  
dies, but only bread and wine. οὐδεὶς τοῦ φαίνεσθαι θυσίας σωμα-  
ματικαῖς κεχρημένος, οὐδὲς δὲ μόνος ἐκείνῳ τὸν Ἀβραάμ δούλον.  
The like is reported in S. Hierome. *Epist. ad Euagrium.*

As for Iosephus that learned Iewe, we admit him for *Iosephus.*  
an eloquent writer of a storie, not for an assured teacher  
of Diuinitie. And yet his authoritie being admitted, Mel-  
chisedeks feasting of Abrahams people inferreth no Ar-  
gument against his Sacrifice in bread and wine. For why  
might he not do the duetie of a Priest first, satisfying the  
mysterie, and the duetie of a liberal Prince afterward in  
refreshing that weary and hungry cōpanie? And there-  
fore touching the worde, *Protulit*, whereby you would *Protulit.*  
proue, that Melchisedek brought forth bread and wine,  
and your other prouision of victuals, I cannot tel what,  
for Abrahams menne: you take great paines in vaine. As  
we are wel hable to proue, *obtulit*, I meane, that Melchi-  
sek offered (to wit bread and wine) so we denie not *pro-*  
*sulit*: that is to say, that he brought those thinges forth. But  
good sir I pray you, in what scoole learned you to make  
this Argumēt, Melchisedek brought forth bread and wine  
to refresh Abrahā, and his men, *ergo*, he offered not bread  
and wine to God in sacrifice? Whereas the scripture after  
mētion made of bred and wine, forthwith addeth, *erat enim* *Genes. 14.*



*Sacerdos Dei altissimi*, for he was the Priest of God the highest : onlesse that cause be vnaptly applied, we must vnderstand, that he was wont to offer vp those thinges to God, which then he brought forth vnto Abraham, geuing the same to him for meate, to God for Sacrifice.

*That Melchisedeck offered, and made his sacrifice in bread and wine.*

Bicause you seme coouertly to denie, that Melchisedeck offered bread and wine in Sacrifice, which some of your syde let not openly to denie, ( which you also would doo, but that by your Challenge you haue bounde your selfe to admitte the olde Doctours ) for that the worde of the texte is *protulit*, and not *obtulit* : I thinke it good to put you in mynde of learned Fathers two, or three, by whom it is auouched, that he offered, and that he made his Sacrifice in bread and wine.

*Arnobius.*

*In Psal.*

*109.*

*Cyprian.*

*lib. 2.*

*Epist. 3.*

*Hieron. in*

*Psal. 109.*

*Arnobius*, who lyued aboue thirtien hundred yeres past, saith, *Panem & vinum solus obtulit in sacerdotibus*, Melchisedech alone among Priestes offered bread and wine. S. Cyprian saith, Melchisedeck was the Priest of the highest God, and (*panem & vinum obtulit*) offered bread and wine. S. Hierome saith, that he offered bread and wine, *Melchisedech obtulit panem & vinum*, be his wordes. The same he hath in his epistle written for Paula to Marcella. S. Ambrose saith it with the same wordes. expressely in two places. *De Sacramentis lib. 4. cap. 3. & lib. 5. cap. 1.* And al these vse the worde, *obtulit*, which you can not away with in the sense of sacrificing. If you demaunde for other witnesses of Melchisedecks Sacrifice in bread and wine, it may please you to reade *Eusebius lib. 5.*



lib. 5. De Demonstratione Euangelica. S. Augustine. in Psal. 33. Concione .r. and in many other places .S. Chrysostome in the Homilie de Proditione Iude. Damascen. lib 4. cap. 14. Castodorus in Psal. 109. To be short, few Doctors can be named, in whom this Sacrifice is not most plainly auouched. So that you would neuer haue douted of it, had you ben learned, much lesse denied it, had you not ben impudent.

As for that you allege out of Tertullian, and S. Ambros, who say that Melchisedek (*obtulis Abrahamo panem & vinum*) offered to Abraham bread and wine: it relieueth your cause neuer a whit. For there the worde *obtulis*, signifieth as much as *exhibuit*, or *dedit*, gaue, or presented: and thereof your selfe being so good a Grammarian, as you are, could not be ignorant. So much the more you shewe your selfe a false handler of this high Mysterie, in twise putting in your false parenthesis, (*not to God, but*) as though Melchisedek had not offered to God any Sacrifice at al.

*Obtulit  
for dedit.*

### Jewel.

S. Paule compareth Christe with Melchisedek, In that, like vnto Melchisedek, he was the kinge of Iustice: In that, he was the Prince of peace, as Melchisedek was: And in that, he had neither Father, nor Mother: For so is it likewise writte of Melchisedek. But of the Sacrifice of Breade, and VVine he speaketh nothing. Yet notwithstandinge, the Auncient holy Fathers oftentimes resemble the same presente of Melchisedek vnto the Sacrifice, that Christe made vpon the Crosse. And in that respect S. Cyprian saith, Christe offered the same thinge, that Melchisedek offered. That is to say, as M. Hardinge himselfe must needes expounde it. The same thinge in perfourmance of Trueth vpon the Crosse, that Melchisedek had before offered in a Figure.

So saith S. Augustine, Illis Petra Christus: Vnto them the Rocke

E F F iij

was

Diuis. 13.

A Reioindre to M. Iewels Reptre

August. in  
Ioan. 17. as  
Stat. 26.

was Christe: And yet not Really, and in deede: but onely by way of Signification, bicause it Signified, and Represented Christe.

Harding.

S. Paule  
speake  
not of it,  
ergo, it is  
not, a com-  
mon Ar-  
gument  
with the  
Ministers  
and here  
vsed by  
M. Iewels.

I graunt that, whereas S. Paule extolleth the Priesthod of Christ, which is after the order of Melchisedek, aboute the Leuitical Priesthod, speaking of certaine thinges, wherein Christe and Melchisedek were like, speaketh nothing of the Sacrifice of bread and wine. What of that? Wil ye thereof conclude, that Melchisedek did not offer vnto God bread and wine? What a fond and Minister-like kinde of Argument is this, S. Paule spake it not, Ergo it is not? S. Paule saith not in al that Epistle, that Christe was conceiued of the holy Ghoste, borne of the virgin Marie: shal it be lawfull for vs therefore to denie it?

Ioan. 16.

Epistola

ad Eua-

grium. In

principio

To. 3. ope-

rum Hie-

ronymi.

Heb. 5.

Hieron.

ad Eua-

grium.

Mysteries

kepte

secret.

We may wel thinke, that therein S. Paule vsed the counsel, that Christ once vsed, when he said, *I haue many thinges to tel you, that ye can not beare away now*. S. Paule sheweth so much him selfe, where beginning to speake of Melchisedek, he doth exaggerate, and very much cofesse the difficultie of that high mysterie with this Proeme, as S. Hierome noteth. *Super quo multus nobis sermo, & ininterpretabilis*. We haue a long proceffe to vtter touching Melchisedek, and such as can not be expounded: Not bicause the Apostle could not expounde it, but bicause it was not a mater conuenient for that time, saith S. Hierome. And wherefore? Bicause he perswaded with the Hebrewes, that is to say, the Iewes, not yet come to the faith, that he might not reuele that sacred and secret Sacrament. And whereas the vessel of Election (saith he) is *astained*

*astained at that Myserie, and confesseth the mater whereof he disputeth, to be unspeakeable (or undeclarable) how much more ought we seely wormes and gnattes, confesse the only knowledge of our unskil? &c.*

S. Augustine speaking vnto his hearers, of whom some were Cathecumens or learners of the faith, thought not good to vtter plainly the doctrine of Melchisedeks Sacrifice. *Fidelibus loquor, &c.* I speake to the faithful (faith he) if there be any Catechumens, that vnderstand it not, let them put away slewth, and maketh hast to haue knowlege. It is not needeful to open the Mysteries, let the Scriptures tel you what the Sacrifice after the order of Melchisedek is. August. in Psal. 109.

If S. Augustine thought it good not to shewe and publish these mysteries abroad, at what time almost the whole world professed the faith of Christ: what good cause had S. Paule not to open the same vnto such as were yet but babes in the faith, and were to be fedde with milke and pappe, rather then with sownde meate, and were not of capacitie for such Mysteries? By consideration of this much it appeareth, of what force your Argument is: S. Paule speaketh nothing of Melchisedeks Sacrifice of bread and wine: *Ergo*, Melchisedek made no such Sacrifice at al. You, that so scornefully reiecte other mennes Argumentes, should haue taken better aduise of your Logique, before you had made such pecuili Arguments your selfe.

*Why S. Paule spake not of the manner of Melchisedeks Sacrifice in bread and wine.*

Thus it may be said, and reasonably, that the greatness of the Myserie, and the vnmeete time and disposition

tion of them, to whom S. Paule wrote, was the cause, why he spake nothing touching the manner and mysterie of Melchisedeks Sacrifice in bread and wine. Another cause of as much importance, or more, was this.

S. Pauls chiefe intent in this place was, for better meane to allure the Iewes vnto the faith, to shewe the excellencie of Christes Priesthod, which is after the order of Melchisedek, in cōparison of the Leuitical Priesthod. This to performe, he setteth forth the prerogatiue of the same about the Leuitical Priesthood, partly on the behalfe of the person of the Priest, partly on the behalfe of the exercise of the Priesthod it selfe. Touching the one, bicause Melchisedek was the type and figure of Christe, and bare the person of Christe, he doth according to the Scriptures attribute great dignities vnto him, as that he was *King of Iustice, King of Peace, the Priest of God the highest, without father, without mother, hauing neither beginning of daies, nor ende.* Which dignities pertained not vnto his owne person in truth, but as he bare the person of Christe the true Melchisedek.

Melchisedek in dignitie as boue Abraham,

Touching the other he declareth out of the booke of Genesis, how he blessed Abraham, and how Abraham gaue vnto him tythes of al thinges, in bothe which consisted the exercise of Priesthood, and thereby Abraham is proued to be of lower degree, then Melchisedek. For without controuersie he is lesse which receiueth blessing, and the geuer of blessing is the greater, by verdict of S. Paule.

Gen. 14.

Heb. 7.

The priesthod after the order of Melchisedek, farr

And as concerning the tythes, that Melchisedek receited of Abraham, Leui him selfe also, who receiued tythes, paid tythes in Abraham, for he was yet in the loynes



loynes of Abraham, as S. Paule saith, when Melchisedek met him. Now whereas the Leuitical Priestes are commaunded according to the lawe to take tythes of the people, and haue thereby a Dignitie aboue the people: Melchisedeks taking of tythes of Abraham their chiefe Patriarke, Prince and head of the whole progenie (and consequently of Leui also, and his children the Priestes of that order, for that they were then in his loynes) doth proue, the preeminēce and excellencie of that Priesthod, in comparison of the Leuitical Priesthod, in so much that in comparison of the same, the Leuites be but Lay men, and of the popular order.

passeth  
the Leui-  
tical Priest-  
hod.

By these, and certaine other Argumentes S. Paule proueth, and setteth forth the excellencie of Christes Priesthod after the order of Melchisedek, aboue the Leuitical Priesthod. Among which he maketh no mention of the manner of Melchisedeks Sacrifice. Bicause if he had alleged, that Melchisedek sacrificed in bread and wine, the Hebrewes woulde soone haue replied, that their sacrifices in that behalfe farre excelled, as the which being of lyuing beastes, had a more glorious shew and countenance, then the Sacrifice of bread and wine. Thus you haue two causes declared, why S. Paule, where he treateth so much of the dignitie of Melchisedek, and of the Priesthod that is after his order, speaketh nothing, at least manifestly, of his Sacrifice in bread and wine.

If the Fathers haue ofentimes resembled this present of Melchisedek vnto the Sacrifice that Christ made vpon the Crosse, as you say: why do you not shewe vs, where we may finde it? Wil any wise man

conclude

GGG

(trow



(trow you) beleue it onely vpon your bare worde? If it be a thing done oftentimes, it was the easier for you to shewe it once. But your *oftentimes* in the ende wil proue neuer. That Melchisedek gaue to Abraham a present of bread and wine, being returned from the battail, it is not denied. but that euer any auncient learned Father resembled that present, as you cal it abhorring the name of Sacrifice, as it had the condition of a present, vnto the Sacrifice that Christe made vpon the Crosse: I vtterly denie it. If any where they resemble the bread and wine that Melchisedek made his Sacrifice. of vnto the Sacrifice of the Crosse, they doo it in respecte that the thing signified by it, that is, the body and bloud of Christe, was one both in the Sacrifice made at the Supper, and also in that which was made vpon the Crosse: and not that the manner of Sacrifice made vpon the Crosse which was bloody, was semblable vnto it. And so in respecte had to the body and bloud of Christe offered vpon the Crosse, and not vnto the manner of offering, I graunt the exposition you make of S. Cyprians wordes to be true. that is to say, that *Christe offered the same thing in performance of truth vpon the Crosse, that Melchisedek had before offered in figure*. But that performance of truth is by the learned Fathers commonly acknowledged in the Sacrifice of the Supper. In which Christe offered his body and bloude vnder the formes of bread and wine after the order of Melchisedek for thankesgeuing, which he offered vpon the Crosse for redemption.

August. in  
Ioan.  
Tract. 26.

Your common figuratiue saying taken out of S. Augustine, *Illis Petra Christus*, vnto them the Rocke was Christe (though it be not altogether so reported of S. Augustine,

Augustin in the place by you coted) is abruptly brought in, to what purpose I see not, but to beguile the vnlearned, as I suppose: who therby may be moued to thinke, that our Sacrifice is as mere a signe, as the figures of the olde lawe were. To this I haue answered once or twice before. In al the frayes ye make against the most holy Mysteries, this bad toole is euer at hand with, you to strik withal.

*Jewel.*

Sometimes they compare it with the Sacrifice of Thankesgeuings, and with the Administration of the holy Communion, and make it equal with the same.

S. Augustine saith, Melchisedek Abrahæ primum, quasi Patri fidelium, tradidit Eucharistiam Corporis, & Sanguinis Domini: Melchisedek gaue first vnto Abraham, as vnto the Father of the Faithful, the Sacramente of the Bodie, and Bloud of Christe. So S. Hierome saith, Melchisedek in typo Christi Panem, & Vinum obtulit, & Mysterium Christianorum in Saluatoris Corpore, & Sanguine dedicauit: Melchisedek in the Figure of Christe offered Breade, and VVine: and dedicated the Mysterie of Christians in the Bodie, and Bloude of Christe. These Authorities might serue, to make some shew, that Melchisedek saide Masse, and Consecrated the Sacrament of the Bodie, and Bloude of Christe, and offered vp Christe in Sacrifice vnto his Father: But of M. Hardinge, or any other suche Priest, they touche nothing.

*Harding.*

You shal neuer shewe vs, where either the Present that Melchisedek gaue to Abraham (by which terme you would abolish the Sacrifice) or the Sacrifice which he made in bread and wine, was copared with the Sacrifice.

GGG ij of thans.

August. in  
quæst. No-  
ui, & Ve-  
ter. Testa-  
mēt. quæst  
109.  
Hierō. ad  
Marcellā.

of thankesgeuing, onlesse it be the Euchariste, which also beareth that name, wherein, the real body and bloud of Christe is present.

As for the ministracion of the holy Communion it is false to say, It is compared with the ministracion, that is to say, with the acte of the ministring the Communion. But I graunt, it is compared to the thing it selfe, that is to say, to the body and bloud of Christe consecrated, offered, and receiued in the holy Communion. Prouided alwaies, that by the holy Communion, we meane not your newe toyce now practized in England by your Ministers that be no Priestes where there is no holy thing consecrated to make it holy, but the holy Communion of the Catholike Church, which S. Dionyse calleth *συνεξις*, and *κοινωνία*.

Dionys. in  
Ecclesiast.  
Hierar-  
chia.

The authoritie you allege vnder the name of S. Augustine, is not S. Augustines. If I had alledged it against you, a great deale of your scoffing Rhetorike should haue ben bestowed, both to reprove the booke, and also me for alleging the same. I am sure, if you haue read either the worke it selfe with any iudgement, or the Censure of Erasmus vpon it: you are perswaded, it is an vnworthy peece of worke to be fathered vpo so worthy a Doctor. As for the very Question it selfe, out of which you bring your authoritie, I maruel you considered not, what Erasmus saith of it. *Quaestione, CIX. multa garris, ut ostendat Melchisedek non fuisse hominem.* In the .CIX. question (saith he) this author maketh a great bible bable, to shewe that Melchisedek was not a man. In the same line there, he speaketh of him, as it were of your selfe, saying. *Quaest. 125. scurram agis.*

But

But who soeuer, and what so euer the author of that worke be, the place is alleged without any dependance, or coherence, as though you cared not in what order you allege testimonies, so you make vp a heape. Either for haste, or (which is more likely) for guile, you leaue out both the beginning, and the ende of it, whereby the meaning is clearely declared. *Melchisedek* (saith the author) *gaue vnto Abraham, as vnto the Father of the faithfull, the Eucharist (or Sacrament) of the body and bloud of Christ.* But what was it that he gaue? It foloweth in the same sentence. *Vi praefiguraretur in Patre, quae in filiis futura erat veritas.* That the truth which was to come in the children, might be foreshewed by a figure in the Father. Doo not these later wordes most euidently declare, that *Melchisedek* gaue onely the figure of the Sacrament of Christes body and bloude to Abraham the Father of the faithfull, and that the truth of that figure, which is the body and bloude of Christe is amongst vs, that are in respect of faith his children?

Quaest. V.  
teris &  
noui testa-  
ment. q.  
109.

That he calleth the thinge, which *Melchisedek* gaue to Abraham, by the name of the Eucharist, it is no great maruel. Whether *S. Augustine* him selfe would so haue spoken, it may be doubted. Verely it is no straunge thing in the olde learned Fathers, to geue the name of the thing signified, vnto the figure, that signifieth, and contrariwise.

This nipping of sentences, specially of such as wordes as open the truth, and ouerthrow your doctrine, doth euerywhere bewray your guileful intent. The whole sentence considered, as it is vttered by the author, doth so clearely serue for confirmation of the real Sacrifices of

M. Jewels  
Nipping  
of sen-  
tences.



Christes body and bloude in the newe Testament: as a more clearer any faithfull man would not desire.

The saying you take out of S. Hierome, I maruel what you meant to allege it. It maketh fully for our parte that is to say, for establishing of the Catholike beleefe. There is mention made bothe of the Figure, bread and wine offered by Melchisedek, and of the veritie, the body and bloude of Christe offered by the Christians in their Mysteries. God be praised, through whose power, his truth is vttered by the mouthes of his enemies. As for your pleasant collection, and scornerful ieasting, howe much it pleaseth you, or becometh the person you haue taken vpon you, I knowe not: Sure I am the holy mysteries of Christian religiō, should with more feare of God be treated of. The roome you occupie, is to reuerent, the mater we handle, too holy, the daies ye ruffle in, too lamentable, the stage you play this parte on, too sad M. Jewel, for you thus to play Hick scorner, I should haue said, lacke scorner. But what may we say? Kinde wil shewe it selfe.

The English Communion compared vwith Melchisedeks Sacrifice, vvhiche M. Iew. calleth Melchisedeks Masse.

If Melchisedek said any Masse, it was like, vnto the English Communion, that offereth nothing els, but bare bread and wine, if it offer ought at al, and feedeth the people with figures, in steede of the truth. Nay this Communion is not by many partes so good, as Melchisedeks oblation, and blessing of Abraham was. For he offered in a figure, and blessed according to his Priesthod, being in time of figures before the truth was come into the worlde: But our prety Cōmunion of England, bringeth forth bare shewes of bread and wine now in the time of grace, the truth being come, and accepted.

Jewel



*Jewel.*

And least any man happen of simplicitie to be deceiued, thinkinge that S. Hierome hereby meante M. Hardinges Real Presence, for that he saith, Melchisedek dedicated the Christian Mysterie in the Bodie and Bloude of Christe, It may please him to consider, that bothe S. Hierome, and also other ancient Fathers haue often used the same manner of speache in other cases, vvherein M. Harding can haue no manner suspicion of Real Presence. S. Hierome saith, Euangelium Pafsione, & Sanguine Domini Dedicatur: The Gospel is Dedicated in the Pafsion, and Bloude of Christe. S. Augustine saith, Quid est mare Rubrum? Sanguine Domini Consecratum: VVhat is the Redde sea? He answeareth, Consecrate in the Bloude of Christe. Againe he saith, Vnde rubet Baptismus Christi, nisi Christi Sanguine Consecratus? VVhereof is Christes Baptisme redde, but that it is Dedicate in the Bloude of Christe? Thus Melchisedek Dedicated the Christian Mysterie in the Bloude of Christe.

*Hieron. ad uers. Iouin. lib. 1.*

*August. in Psal. 80.*

*August. in Ioan. tra. 11.*

*Harding.*

Al that here foloweth to the ende of the Replie to this Diuision, toucheth not at al any thing by me written or said. But it is inferred by M. Jewel vpon occasion of a testimonie of S. Hierom which he him selfe alleged, fearing in the conceit of his owne imagination, that S. Hierome wil be found against him in the very place, where he craued helpe of him, as he is directly against him in deede. And here is a great feare conceiued, least forsooth the reader should be deceiued, and thinke, that S. Hierome in this place meant the real Presence. Then tel vs good Sir, onlesse the body and bloude of Christe be really present in the Mysterie of the Christians, how is not the Figure of Melchisedech, who dedicated the same, as good and as worthy, as is the Mysterie it selfe

*M. Iuels feare, least the Eucharist be accounted a better thing, than bread and vvine.*

it selfe of the Christians, which was dedicated ?

But, say you, where so euer any thing is said to be dedicated in the body and bloude of Christe, there his body and bloude are not consequently present, as it may appeare by the example aboue alleged, and by many other the like. I graunt this muche, what then? Wil it thereof folow by necessary consequent, that in the Mysterie of the Christians, whereof Melchisedeks Oblation was a figure, and which was by him dedicated in a figure, the body and bloude of Christe is not really present? specially whereas Christe him selfe doth in termes pronounce, *This is my body, this is my bloude?* What neede you here to talke so much of the real presence? You know pardy, I stay not vpon this saying of S. Hierome, for proufe of the real presence, as though we had not many other, and manifestter proufes for it.

Matt. 26.

Luc. 22.

Marc. 14.

1. Cor. 11.

I confesse, if Christe had neuer spoken those wordes, and had neuer made promise, that he would geue vs in our Mysterie *the selfe same flesh, that he would geue for the life of the worlde*: S. Hieromes testimonie of it selfe were not a sufficient proufe, like as neither his saying, that *the Ghospel is dedicated by the Passion and bloude of Christe*, doth force vs to graunt, that the Ghospel is the real bloude of Christe for lacke of Christes owne worde pronouncing, that the Ghospel is his bloude. And likewise for lacke of the worde of Christe saying, that Baptisme is his very bloude, which is shed for remission of sinne, although it be said by S. Augustine, not onely of Baptisme it selfe, but also of the Read Sea which was a figure of it, that they were redde, as being consecrate in the bloude of Christe: yet neither of them is in deede

Ioan. 6.

Christes

Christes bloude.

Concerning your phrase of *dedicating*, alleged out of S. Hierome, I see not to what purpose it serueth you, but to dazel the eyes of the vnlearned. The circumstance of the place doth easily shewe, what he meant by saying, *The Gospel is dedicated by the Passion and bloude of Christe*, for so it is to be turned. Bicause Iouinian the heretique, against whom he wrote making mariage equal with virginitie, after that he had in his booke alleged examples of the olde testament, folowing his order, pretended to come to the Gospel, and then in commendation of Mariage brought forth Zacharie, Elizabeth, and Peter with his wiues mother, as perteining to the time of the new Testament, and to the Gospel: S. Hierome taketh him vp roundly, and twiteth him of ignorance, saying, *Consueti Recordia non intelligit istos quoque inter eos qui legi seruiert, debuisse numerari. Neque enim Euangelium ante Crucem Christi est, quod Passione & sanguine ipsius dedicatur.* Thorough his accustomed doltishnes he vnderstandeth not, that they also ought to haue ben numbred among them, that were vnder the lawe. For the Gospel is not before the Crosse of Christe. (that is to say before Christe was crucified) whiche is dedicated by his Passion and bloude.

S. Hierome meaneth by these last wordes, that the time of the Gospel beganne, when Christe had suffered his Passion, and shed his bloude, and not before. And here this worde *Gospel*, signifieth not the booke written by the Euangelistes, but the state and condition of the newe Testament: Whiche tooke force, and was dedicated, that is to say, was consecrated, and made holy to the

HHH

seruice

VWhat S.  
Hierom  
vnder-  
stode by  
the terme  
of dedi-  
cation.

Hieron.  
lib. 1. ad-  
uersus Io-  
uinianu.

Gospel.

seruice and honour of God, by the Passion and bloude of Christe. Therefore he noteth Iouinian to be but a dolte, in that he did attribute the Mariages of Zacharie and Elizabeth, and Peter, to the Gospel, whiche in deed belonged vnto the lawe of the olde Testament, because the lawe continewed, til Christe had suffered his Passion, as he said him selfe, *Consummatum est*, it is ended. In like sense S. Hierome vseth the worde of *Dedicating* in the same booke a litle before, saying, *Virginitatem a Saluatore uirgine dedicari*, that virginitie is dedicated by our Sauour being a virgin, for that now it is otherwise with vs, then it was with them of the olde lawe, and with those to whom it was said, *Grow ye, and be ye multiplied*, and that virginitie is now sithens our Sauour came in fleske, more generally commended, then it was before among them, who (as there S. Hierome saith) haue geuen vs types and figures of things to come.

*August. in Psal. 89.* The redde Sea is consecrate in the bloude of our Lorde, saith S. Augustin. Againe, *Baptisme* (saith he) is redde, being consecrate in the bloude of Christe. The meaning hereof is, As our finnes be taken away and cleansed in baptisme taking vertue and effect of the bloude of Christ through faith: So to the Iewes was forefigured the bloude of Christe in the redde Sea. Baptisme is redde with the bloude of Christe, and is consecrate by the same. Thus it is said, because it is ordeined by Christe to be a meane, whereby the effect and merite of his bloude is through faith imparted vnto vs. This much weighed and considered, it may soone to any man appeare, how litle reliefe M. Jewel shal finde in these phrases.

The



The .14. Division.

The Answer.

**O**F al other Oecumenius speaketh most plainly to this purpose vpon this place of S. Paule alleged out of the Psalme, Tu es Sacerdos in æternum secundum Ordinem Melchisedech. Thou arte a Priest for euer after the order of Melchisedek. His wordes be these, Significat sermo, quod non solum Christus obtulit incruentam hostiam ( siquidem suum ipsius corpus obtulit ) verum etiam qui ab ipso fungentur Sacerdotio, quorum Deus Pontifex esse dignatus est, sine sanguinis effusione offerent. Nam hoc significat ( in æternum ). Neque enim de ea, quæ semel à Deo facta est Oblatio, & Hæstia, dixisset in æternum, sed respiciens ad præsentēs Sacrificos, per quos medios Christus sacrificat, & sacrificatur, qui etiam in Mystica Cœna modum illis tradidit huiusmodi Sacrificij.

Oecumen.  
in Epist. ad  
Heb. cap. 5  
Psal. 119.

The meaninge of this place is ( saith he ) that not onely Christe offered an Vnbloudy Sacrifice, for he offered his owne Bodie, but also that they, which after him shal doo the office of a Priest ( whose Bishop he vouchesaueth to be ) shal offer without shedding of Bloud. For that signifieth the worde ( For euer. ) For cōcerning that Oblation, and Sacrifice, which was once

HHH ij made



made by God, he would neuer saye, (In æternum) for euer. But ( he saide so ) hauing an eye to those Priestes, that be nowe, by the mediation of whom Christe sacrificeth, and is sacrificed: who also in his Mystical Supper taught by tradition the manner of such a Sacrifice.

Concerning the Prophecie of Malachie, for proufe of this Oblation, though the place of Ireneus aboue recited may stande in steede of many auctorities, yet I wil not let to rehearse the sayings of a Father or two, for confirmation of this Article.

In Psal.  
95.

Chrysostome saith very plainely, In omni loco Sacrificium offertur nomini meo, & Sacrificiū purum. Vide quā luculenter, quāque dilucidē Mysticam interpretatus est Mensam, quæ est Incruenta hostia. In euery place a Sacrifice shal be offered to my name, and that a pure Sacrifice. See, how plainely, and clearely he interpreted the Mystical Table, which is the Vnbloudy Sacrifice.

Jewel.

Here mighte I iustly take exception against this Doctour, as findinge him without the compasse of the first sixe hundred yeeres. How he is, He saith not, That the Priestke hath power, or Authoritie, to Sacrifice the Sonne of God, nor seemeth any waie to fauer M. Hardinges purpose. Therefore we shal not neede to touche his credits.

HHH ij Harding.

Harding.

In this Diuision Mr. Iewel, you set forth as it were in a moustre, a number of authorities, and not one to the purpose. Yet fewe thinges excepted, you tel vs litle here, that you haue not tolde vs before. One apte and plaine testimonie would haue holpen your cause more, then al this impertinent and confuse number. It is not harde for one that is furnished with stoare of Notebookes of common places, as you are, to fil the paper with heapes of allegations. This kinde of writing, as to the ignorant it maketh a false shewe of stoare of learning, so to the learned, bringeth assured euidence of lacke, bothe of truth, and iudgement. You are much beholding to your Phrases, and metaphorical speeches. For in them at least, as in a smooddering smoke, you trust to conuey your selfe away, that the weaknessse of your parte appeare not openly, as it should, if you would directly answer to the pointes, where with the truth of our syde is confirmed. By this you shewe your selfe to be mynded not to yeelde and to subscribe according to your promise, what so euer, and how much so euer be proued against you.

Concering Oecumenius in my Answer alleged, you might iustly take exception against him, you say for that he falleth without the compasse of the first six hundred yeres. As though an Author allowed by the best learned of the Church for the speace of an vnknown time, should be of lesse credite, then an other, that wrote one hundred yeres before him. As though also after the first six hundred yeres the holy Ghoste

Oecumenius.

HHH iij for

forsooke the Church, and therefore least it vnfurnished of good and learned teachers. Of what age he was, I trowe it is not certainly knowen: but that he is of great antiquitie, it is certaine. Neither can ye refuse him for a Papist, bicause he was of the Greke Church, which your selfe haue cleared of Papistrie. Wel touching his credite, forasmuch as vpon a braue shewe of a confidence in your cause, you are so good Mayster vnto him, as not to take exception against him: we take that ye geue. Let it then stand for good and allowed, as in deede, there is no cause but so it should.

M. Iewel  
speaketh  
directly  
against  
his owne  
knowe  
ledge  
touching  
Oecumenius.

Bicause you pretend in worde (knowing the contrary in harte) that this testimonie of *Oecumenius* maketh no prouise for the Sacrifice against your Challenge: whether it be so, or no, let it be briefly examined. First, saith he not, that Christe him selfe offered an vnbloudy Sacrifice? By the epipheton *Vnbloudy*, added to Sacrifice, is it not manifest, that this Sacrifice was distincte and diuers from the Sacrifice, that he made vpon the Crosse, which was bloudy? Nexte, least any man might happen to doubt, what the substance was, which was offered vnbloudily by Christe, doth not this Author declare it by his plaine Parenthesis, saying, *for he offered his owne body*? Is it not cleare then, that Christes body was the substance, which he offered vnbloudily? Note then good Reader, that the substance, which was offered bloudily vpon the Crosse, and vnbloudily at the Supper (for that was the time when the vnbloudy Sacrifice was made) by this testimonie is al one, to wit the body of Christe. the body of Christe, I say, and not onely thanks geuing, praises, and remembrance, of his

That  
Christ offered his  
owne  
body vn-  
bloudly.

his Death, whereunto onely you M<sup>a</sup> Jewel would draw it. Thus it is euident, that Christe him selfe offered to his Father, not onely a bloody, but also an vnbloudy Sacrifice.

Let vs see, whether by *Oecumenius* it may appeare, that Priestes haue authoritie to offer vp the vnbloudy Sacrifice. Verely it appeareth most manifestly. For saith he, *Not onely Christe offered the vnbloudy Sacrifice, but also they, which from him shal doo the office of Priestes, shal offer without shedding of blood.* Marke M<sup>a</sup> Jewel, The Priestes, that shal haue authoritie from Christe their hye Bishop to execute the office of Priesthod, shal offer vnbloudly. But what shal they offer? What other thing, but that which Christe offered? What offered Christe? An vnbloudy Sacrifice. What was the substance, of that vnbloudy Sacrifice? His very body. *Suum ipsius corpus obtulit*, he offered his owne body, saith *Oecumenius*. Therefore the Priestes shal offer the vnbloudy Sacrifice, which is Christes body, and the same shal they doo vpon good authoritie, for that in so doing, they shal execute the Priesthod, which they shal receiue, *ab ipso*, from him, that is, from Christe.

If you can tel vs of any power and warrant more sufficient, than that which commeth from Christe vnto the Priestes of his Church, then shal you require me to yeeld, and with you to confesse, that Priestes doo without good authoritie presume to offer vp Christe vnto his Father in their daily Sacrifice.

You wil say perhaps. I heare that Priestes shal offer Christes body without shedding of blood, but that they haue any authoritie graunted them so to doo, yet I heare

That Priestes haue authoritie to offer the vnbloudy Sacrifice.



heare not. It may please you for this to consider, what followeth in Oecumenius. *This terme, In aeternum, for ever, signifieth so much, as that Priestes shal offer in executing their Priesthod from Christe, his vnbloudy Sacrifice. For the Prophete Dauid would neuer haue said, that Christe* Psal. 107, *was a Priest for ever, in respect of the Sacrifice, which Christe made once onely upon the Crosse: but in respect of the Priestes, that be now lyuing, by whom as by meanes and instrumentes, or rather ministers, Christe bothe doth offer Sacrifice, and is offered in Sacrifice. Loe here by the ministerie of the Priestes, Christe doth presently sacrifice, and is sacrificed. so that they do their office of Priesthode presently, and accomplish that in deede, whereby the Priesthod of Christe after the order of Melchisedek is daily put in practise, and so continewd for ever, not onely in power and vertue, but also in acte and effecte.*

VVhere gaue Christe to Priestes auctorite to sacrifice his body. It remaineth it be shewed, where, and when, Christe gaue them authoritie thus to doo. Oecumenius in the ende of this allegation saith it more plainly, then it may be doubted of, much lesse denied. *Qui etiam in mystica cena modum illis tradidit huiusmodi Sacrificij.* Christe in his Mystical Supper deliuered vnto them the manner of such a Sacrifice. I presuppose no man to be so vaine a wrangler, as to cauille for that Oecumenius saith not, *he deliuered them authoritie, but the manner how to offer this Sacrifice.* For the deliuering of the manner how to doo it, had nothing auailed, onlesse he had withal deliuered authoritie lawfully to execute it. Thus haue you in this one authoritie expressed al the termes of your Challenge, to wit, that Priestes haue authoritie to offer vnto Christe vnto his Father in Sacrifice. For here is mention



tion made of Priestes, of sacrificing vnbloudily, of the body of Christe, and therefore of Christe him selfe, of authoritie, because they execute Priesthod in the person of Christe, from Christe, and for Christe, in that they be meanes by whom Christ sacrificeth, and is sacrificed. The same authoritie is further auouched, by that, that Christe deliuered vnto them in his last Supper, the manner of such a Sacrifice.

How be it I was deceiued in saying, that al the termes of your Challenge be expressed in this testimonie: for here lacketh the name of the Father. But the Father of heauen be thanked, that it forceth not muche, whether his name be expressed or no, seing it is so necessarily included. For to whom should Christe offer Sacrifice, but to his Father? To whom ought man offer Sacrifice, but to God onely, as to whom and to none other, that kinde of seruice is due?

If you require a plaine place witnessing that Priestes haue authoritie to offer vp Christe, heare what the Fathers of the first Nicen Council say. *The Council is aduertised (say they) that in certaine places, and Cities, Diacons gene the Sacramentes vnto Priestes. This neither Rule, nor Custome hath deliuered vnto vs, that they who haue not power to offer vp the Sacrifice, should deliuer the body of Christe vnto them, that haue power to offer it.* Here you may see it expressely auouched, that Priestes haue authoritie and power to offer vp, the body of Christe. Now let vs see, what you answer to the plaine place of Oecumenius.

This sacrifice auouched by the Nicen Council.

Concil. Nicen. Canon. 14.

Hieron. in  
Psal. 86.

Hieron. in  
Psal. 97.

Augustin.  
quest. Euā.  
lib. 2.

August. de  
verbis Do-  
mini Secū.

Luc. Sermon.  
38.

Chrysost. in  
Acta. hom.  
21.

De Conf.  
distinct. 2.

Quid sit.

The vvhole Contentes of his vvordes are these: That there is in the Church an Vnbloudy Sacrifice, and that Christe him selfe offereth vp the same by the meane, and Ministerie of the Priest, and that Christe him selfe is that Sacrifice. Which vvordes vvith due construction, and in the sense, and meaning of the Ancient Fathers, may vvell be graunted. For like as S. Hierom saith, as it is alleged before, Quod natū est ex Virgine, nobis quotidiē nascitur: Christus nobis quotidiē crucifigitur: Christe, that was borne of the Virgin, is borne vnto vs euery day: Christe vnto vs is daily Crucified: And, as S. Augustin saith, Tum Christus cuique occiditur, cum credit Occisum: Then is Christe presently slaine to euery man, when he trusteth wholly in his Death, and beleueth he was slaine: And as the same S. Augustin saith, Tibi Christus quotidiē Resurgit: Christe Riseth againe to thee euery daie: And, as Chrysostome saith, In the Holy Mysteries is wrought, and perfited the Death of Christ: Briefely, as Gregorie saith, Christus iterum in hoc Mysterio Moritur: Christe is slaine in this Mysterie, and dieth againe: Euen so, and in the same sense, and meaning, and none other vvise, Oecumenius saith, Christe is offered in the Holy Supper.

But, as Christe neuer is daily Borne of the Virgin, nor daily Crucified, nor daily Slaine, nor daily Riseth from the dead, nor daily Suffereth, nor daily Dieth, but onely in a certaine manner of Speache, not verily, and in dede: Euen so Christ is daily Sacrificed, only in a certaine manner of speach, and in a Mysterie: But Really, verily, and in dede he is not Sacrificed.

Harding.

Greates  
pointes con-  
tained in  
the testi-  
monie of  
Oecume-  
nius by  
M. Iewell  
dissembled.

There is more comprehended in the vvordes of Oecumenius, then you reporte. For he saith, that Christe hath offered the Vnbloudy Sacrifice, which he expoundeth to haue ben the oblation of his owne body. Which can not be otherwise vnderstanded, then of the Oblation made at the Supper, as onely being vnbloudy, for the Oblation made

made vpon the Crosse was bloudy, as you konwe. Againe, he saith, that *Christes Priesthod after the order of Melchisedek endureth for euer, for that euen to this day he sacrificeth, and is sacrificed, by the meane of Priestes now being.* Furthermore, that *Christe in his last Supper deliuered to them the manner of such a Sacrifice.* These be pointes contained in this testimonie of Oecumenius, besides those which you haue noted, and be such as you and your felowes can not wel brooke, and therefore your policie was to dissemble them.

To the whole place you answer by comparing it (as your manner is to doo) vnto certaine phraſes, and figuratiue speeches of the Fathers, in which they say one thing in founde of worde, and meane an other, or at least, in which their meaning is to be vnderſtanded Myſtically, and not exactly to be conſtrued after the rigour of the precise termes. Six sentences, or rather peeces of sentences you pretend to allege, which you wil nedes haue to be like vnto this testimonie of *Oecumenius*. Of which six, the first is your owne, and not S. Hieromes at al, as you vtter it. As for the second, there is no such thing in his Commentaries vpon the Psalme. 97. as your cotation directeth: the fourth is not to be founde in the. 38. Sermon of S. Augustine *De verbis Domini secundum Lucā*, as you note, because he neuer made of that matter but. 37. Sermons. The fifth is falsified, S. Chrysostom vttereth it otherwise. The third, and the sixth, if you had alleged them whole, as they lye in the authours, would seme to make nothing for you, as here it shal be declared.

If humanitie required me not to deale rigorously with you, but gentilly to beare with you, not to reuele

M. Tew. r. 6  
neth to  
his phras  
ses and fi  
guratiue  
speeches  
for answer  
to that  
vvhich is  
spoken in  
ppr spea  
che and li  
terally.

Shiftes  
not to be  
borne  
vwith in  
a preas  
cher.

Answer  
to the first  
authoritie  
alleged  
out of S.  
Hierom

your false sleightes to your discredite, but for your honesties sake to winke at them: then thus should you be answered. 1. Where S. Hierome saith, *Si volumus, quotidie nascitur Christus*, If we wil, Christ is borne euery day: the worde *Christe* is not taken in proper signification for the second person, but for any vertue, that man may worke, bicause it is said of him, that *he is the vertue and wisdom of his Father*, as I haue before declared. Now where Oecumenius saith, *Christe hath offered an vnbloudy Sacrifice (for he hath offered his owne body): Christe hath vouchesaued to be our Bishop, Christe sacrificeth, and is sacrificed by meanes of the Priestes that now be, Christe deliuered vnto them the way and manner of such Sacrifice in his mystical Supper*: in al these speeches *Christ* is the name, not of *vertue* and *power* indefinitely, but of the only begotten Sonne of God, the second Person in Trinitie, that was conceiued by the holy Ghoste, and borne of the virgin Marie. Therfore there is no similitude or likenesse between the Phrase of S. Hierome (which in truth is as here I allege, and not as you forge it) and this saying of Oecumenius. Whereas then your Argument is this, *As Christ is borne euery day, so is he offered by Priestes euery day, But he is not really and in deede borne euery day: Ergo neither is he offered by Priestes euery day*: If this be your Argument, your *Maior*, or first proposition, is false, bicause (as I haue shewed) the similitude holdeth not, and the case is not like. And so S. Hierome doth nothing helpe your cause.

Crucify-  
ing of  
Christe  
conside-  
red tyvo  
waies.

Touching your other places, one Answer in manner may serue for them al. 2. *Christe vnto vs is daily crucified*, saith S. Hierome perhaps some where, or some other  
Father



Father, for your cotation is false. This much is to be considered. The crucifying of Christe, is of two sortes. The one external, and bloody. The other mystical, and vn-bloody. In that, Christes bloude was shed, to be the general redemption: In this the bloude of Christe already shed is applyed vnto vs, that is to say, the effecte of his bloude to particuler remission of synnes, and paines dew to sinnes, as if he were now hanging vpon the Crosse. This application of Christes death vnto vs, is sometimes of the Fathers called, his Crucifying, sacrificing, Death, and killing. After the first way, he was neuer crucified but once. After the second way, he is crucified daily, and so often as the Death of him that was crucified, is (the sacrament of Reconciliation presupposed) applied vnto vs to effecte.

Neither is the doctrine of Application of Christes Death strange. The substance of it hath ben taught in diuers respectes by the learned Fathers of the Church bothe olde, and newe. Albeit the terme of *Application* be more common in the Scholastical Doctours, who haue treated most exactly of these pointes, then in the most Auncient writers. Tertullian writing against Marcion, and S. Hierom vpon S. Mathew, to signifie the real presence, vse the terme of *Representation*, whereby is signified in Latin the exhibiting of a thing present.

Applica-  
tion.

Tertul. lib.  
1. aduersus  
Marcion.  
Hierony.  
in Matth.  
cap. 26.  
Representa-  
tion.  
Gregorius.  
Homi. 37.  
Repara-  
tion or  
repairing  
Dialog. 4.  
cap. 58.

S. Gregorie expresseth the same meaning that Application containeth, by the terme of *Repairing*, or *renning*. So often as we offer vp vnto him (saith he) the hoste of his Passion, so often we renue and repaire his Passion vnto vs for absolution. Againe in an other place. This hoste (or Sacrifice, saith he) doth singularly saue the soule from damna-



tion, which by Myſterie reuueeth vnto vs the Death of the only begotten Sonne of God.

Inſinuation.

S. Auguſtine ſignifieth this muche by the worde of *Inſinuation*. Now who ſo euer doth inſinuate a thing to an other, that is to ſay, putteth it in his boſome (for ſo muche the worde ſignifieth) the ſame doth alſo applie it vnto him. For declaration hereof S. Auguſtines teſtimonie by your ſelfe here alleged, ſerueth very aptly. Which if you had with more ſinceritie and truth alleged, you had dealt more like a true man: but then had you hindered your euil cauſe. His wordes be theſe, where he expoundeth the Parable of the Riotous Sonne written

Luce. 15.  
Auguſt.  
Queſtion.  
Euangel.  
lib. 2. 33.

by S. Luke, making *Vitulum ſaginum*, the fatted caſſe to be Chriſte. Our Lorde (ſaith he) was this fatted Caſſe, who according to fleſh was filled with reproches. *Quod autem imperat vt adducant eum, quid aliud eſt, niſi vt predicent eum, & annunciando venire faciant in exhausta fame viscera filij eſurientis? Nam etiam vt occidant eum iubet, hoc eſt, vt mortem eius inſinuent. Tunc enim cuique occiditur, cum credit occiſum.* Whereas he commaundeth them to bring him, what is that to ſay els, but that they preache him, and by telling of him, cauſe him to come into the bowels quite famiſhed for hunger of the hungry ſonne? For he commaundeth alſo that they kill him, that is to ſay, that they inſinuate and ſhewe his Death: For then he is ſlaine to euery man, when he beleueth, that he was ſlaine.

S. Auguſtine vn-  
derſtandeth  
death by  
the killing  
of Chriſte  
now, the  
inſinuation  
of his  
death.

3. Thus S. Auguſtine expounded him ſelfe, who maketh the killing of Chriſte now, to be none other, but the inſinuation of his Death vnto vs by preaching. Chriſt was once killed corporally and in deede. And now he is

he is killed, as concerning the Application of the benefit of his Death, that is to say, his death is insinuate and applied vnto vs, when we beleue hat he was killed for vs. Which Death neuerthelesse, to wit, the effect of his Death, is applied vnto vs not by faith only, but also faith presupposed, by meane of the Sacraments.

So Christe is said by S. Augustine *to rise againe to vs* In vvhath *every day*, bicause we beleue that he rose againe. *sense M,*

S. Chrysostom saith not simply, as you reporte, *the Death of Christe is wrought, and perfited in the holy My-* *levvels*  
*steries: but illa mors perficitur*, that Death is perfited, *mystical*  
asmuch to say, the vnbloudy and Mystical Death, that *speaches*  
is, the vertue and effect of his Death is applied vnto vs. *alleged*  
*out of the*  
*Fathers*  
*be true,*

So meant S. Gregorie saying, *that Christe, lying immor-* *Dum illa*  
*tally in him selfe, dieth againe in this Mysterie.* That is *mors per-*  
to say, as there he expoundeth him selfe, *this health-* *ficitur.*  
*ful Sacrifice repaireth and renueth vnto vs,* (and apply-  
eth vnto vs) *by mysterie, the Death of Gods onely begoten*  
*Sonne.*

Whereas then the learned Fathers speake thus of *De Con-*  
Christes daily birth, of his daily crucifying, his daily kil- *secrat.*  
ling, and his daily resurrection, they meane not a real and *dist. 2.*  
a carnal presencé of his body to be borne, to be crucifi- *Quid sit*  
ed, to be slaine, and to rise againe from the Dead: but al is  
spoken mystically, and the same is true in a manner of  
speache, and in a mystical sense, as now I haue de-  
clared.

But where they speake, as Oecumenius here speaketh,  
of th' vnbloudy host, or Sacrifice, naming it (by way of ex-  
positiō) Christes own body, saying of it, that *they, who haue*  
*Priesthod.*

*Psal. 109.*

*Priesthood from him, do offer it up in Sacrifice without shedding of bloude, and that for their continual offering of the same, Christe is called a Priest for euer, by whom he sacrificeth, and is sacrificed, to whom also at his Mystical Supper he deliuered the manner of such Sacrifice, where so euer they speake of this Sacrifice, and after this manner: there they meane a true and real Sacrifice, and thereby signifie, that Christe is sacrificed verely, really, and in deede. Whiche notwithstanding is to be vnderstanded in respect of the body of Christe, really, and in deede by vertue of Christes wordes made present in the Sacrament, being the thing sacrificed, and not in respect of the common bloudy manner of sacrificing. Whiche manner, vntil Christe was sacrificed vpon the Crosse, who is the truth and ende of al Sacrifices that were before, was for the most parte with shedding of bloude, and with slaughter of lyuing things.*

In vwhat  
sense and  
respect is  
Christe  
now  
Sacrificed,  
and not  
sacrificed.  
*Rom. 6.*

*Irenæus li.  
4. cap. 32.*

To be plaine, and shorte, in respect of that olde and common manner of sacrificing, we denie, as you doo, that Christe is now really, verely, and in deede sacrificed. For *hauiug bene once dead, he dieth no more*, as S. Paule saith. But in respect of the substance of the Sacrifice (which thing the olde lerned Fathers haue euer taught, and the Church practiseth, as deliuered, commaunded, and taught by Christe at his last Supper, as S. Irenæus saith) whiche substance is the body of Christe, and consequently Christe him selfe the Sonne of God: We affirme, and beleue, and promise to defend with our bloude, that Christe in our Mysterie is most truly, really, verely, and in deede sacrificed.

Jewel.

Iewel.

The reste, that followeth in Oecumenius, onely expresseth the two several Natures in Christe, the Godheade, and the Manheade: That, touchinge his Manheade, he was Sacrificed: touchinge his Godheade, he was the Prieste, and made the Sacrifice: And further to M. Hardinges purpose it maketh no thinge. So Beda saith, although somewhat otherwise: Filius Dei, & Orat pro nobis: & Orat in nobis: & Oratur à nobis. Orat pro nobis, vt Sacerdos: Orat in nobis, vt caput: Oratur à nobis, vt Deus: The Sonne of God both Praieth for vs: and Praieth in vs: and is Praied of vs. He Praieth for vs, as our Prieste: He Praieth in vs, as our Heade: He is praied of vs, as our God. Epiphanius saith, Christus est Victima, Sacerdos, Altare, Deus, Homo, Rex, Pontifex, Ovis, Agnus, omnia in omnibus pro nobis factus: Christ is our Sacrifice, our Priest, our Aultar, God, Má. King, Bishop, Sheepe, Láme, made for our sakes al in al. Thus is Christ our Sacrifice: thus is Christ our Sacrificer, not to be offered by the Priest, as M. Harding imagineth: but as the olde Maisters, and Fathers of the Church haue taught vs. offered by him selfe vpon the Crosse. S. Augustin saith, Ecce illic oblatus est: Ibi seipsum obtulit: Simul & Hostia, & Sacerdos. Et altare erat Crux: Beholde there was he offered: There he offered him selfe: He was both the Priest, and the Sacrifice: And his Crosse was the Aultare.

Harding.

This answer is farre fetched, and proceedeth from a great insight. Fewe men but M. Iewel could haue seene so farre in Oecumenius woordes, as to see in them that which by him was neuer meant, nor so much as dreamed of, yea that, which also is very false, and an heynous heresie, if it be obstinately mainteined.

But Sir wote ye what ye speake, or speake you at al aduenture? Surely here you are taken. Neither can you escape, but must needes confesse your errour and yeeld. Was Christ touchinge his Godhead a Priest, and touchinge

Beda in  
Episto. ad  
Ephes. c. 20

Epipha. de  
Melchise-  
dechian.  
lib. 2.  
Augu. De  
Tempore.  
Serm. 130.

M. Iewel  
either of  
ignorance,  
or of Ma-  
lice vttes  
reth ma-  
nifest her  
resie.

KKK

the



the same made he Sacrifice? Who euer said so, but you? What M. Iewel besides other heresies, shal we haue an Ariā of you? Wil you take that name vpo you, or cōfesse, *Aug. cont. that you lacke the principles of Diuinitie? To offer Sa-*  
*Fausst. lib. crifice, is it not a kinde of worship called Latria, that is*  
*20. ca. 21. due vnto God onely, and to no creature? Now shal we*  
 make Christe, as he is God, to doo worship, and not to receiue worship onely done to him by others? Is not God the Sonne, equal with God the Father? Or wil you make vs a great God, and a lesse God, as we reade that  
*Philp. 2. Arius did? Saith not S. Paule, Whereas he was in the forme*  
*of God, he thought it no Robberie to be equal with God? As*  
 he is God, how doth he the office of the Priest? How doth he Sacrifice? Is not he that sacrificeth, inferiour to him, to whom sacrifice is done? The creature worshippeth God, and offereth Sacrifice vnto him. That God worshippeth ought, and doth Sacrifice, there was neuer any so ignorant, and blasphemous, as to speake it. This doctrine smelleth of the Arians, who affirme, the Sonne of God to be inferiour to his Father. Our Lorde saue his people from such blinde guydes, and false Prophetes.

Christe sacrificeth  
 as man,  
 not as  
 God, but  
 as God re-  
 ceiueth  
 Sacrifice.  
*August. de*  
*Ciuitat.*  
*Dei. li. 10.*  
*cap. 20.*

S. Augustine is more worthy to be hearde, who farre otherwise teacheth vs, that Christe receiueth Sacrifice as God, and offereth Sacrifice as man. His wordes be these. *Vernus ille mediator, in quantum formam serui accipiens, mediator effectus est Dei & hominum, homo Christus Iesus, cum in forma Dei Sacrificium cum Patre sumat, cum quo & vnus Deus est, tamen in forma serui Sacrificium maluit esse, quam sumere, ne vel hac occasione quisquam existimaret, cuiuslibet esse sacrificandū creatura. Per hoc & Sacerdos est, ipse*



*est, ipse offerens, ipse & oblatio.* That the true mediatur, in asmuch as he tooke the fourme of a Seruaunt, was made the mediatur of God and menne, the man Christ Iesus, whereas in the fourme of God he taketh Sacrifice with the Father, with whom he is one God, yet in the fourme of a Seruaunt he had rather be a Sacrifice, then take (Sacrifice) least through this occasiō some man might thinke, that Sacrifice were to be made to any what so euer creature. By this he is a Priest, him selfe being he that offereth, and also the thing that is offered. In this testimōie S. Augustine saith expressely, that Christe as touching his manhead, and as he is man, is both the Priest that offereth, and the Sacrifice offered: and that touching his Godhead; and as he is God, he receiueth Sacrifice. Which is quite contrary to that you here affirme.

Answer me to this question M. Iewel. Beleue you that Christe was a Priest after the order of Melchisedek, before he became man, or only after that he became man? If your answer be, that he was Priest of that order after he had taken our flesh, I haue nothing to say against you. For that is the truth. But if your answer shalbe, that he was such a Priest before flesh taken, as you must answere, if you wil defend this your doctrine: then wil I turne you ouer vnto S. Augustine, who I am sure in al wise mennes iudgement ouermatcheth you, and is to be credited before you, and al your Scoolemaisters of Zurich, or Geneua.

This profounde learned Father expounding these woordes of the Psalme, *Thou art a Priest for euer after the Order of Melchisedek*, saith, *Ad hoc natus ex vtero ante luciferū, vt esses Sacerdos in aeternum secundum ordinem*

August. in  
Psal. 109.

Non Sa-  
cerdos.

*ordinē Melchisedech.* Thou wast borne from the wombe (of the virgin) before the daie sterre, that thou mightest be a Priest for euer after the order of Melchisedek. And there estones. *Secundū id quod natus est de Patre Deus apud Deum, coeternus gignenti, non Sacerdos: sed Sacerdos propter carnem assumptam, propter victimam, quam pro nobis offerret à nobis acceptam.* As touching that Christe was borne of the Father God with God, he is equally euerlasting with him that begotte him, not a Priest: but a Priest for the fleshe assumed, for the hoste, that he should offer for vs, being taken of vs. Nothing can more plainly be spoken against you M. Iewel, which nowe beginne to teache the worlde a newe heresie, and prepare a way to the reciduation of Arius heresie, by affirming that Christe was a Priest, and made Sacrifice, according to his Godhead. Whereof it must folow, that as being God, he was not equal with his Father.

M. Iewels  
promise  
made in  
his last  
Sermon  
at Poules  
Crosse.

Be not a shamed M. Iewel, to recant this fowle and grosse error. I vnderstand you said in your Sermon at Poules Crosse the .xv. of Iune laste, that if you had euer either spoken in Pulpit, or written in booke any thing that may be prooued false, your mouth should confesse it, and your hand should retracte it. By this it shal appeare to al men, how farre your worde is to be trusted.

The wordes of Beda, Epiphanius, and S. Augustine, which here you allege, I see not to what purpose they serue you. For they prooue no more that Christe, touching his Godhead was euer a Priest and a Sacrificer, then that the Moone is made of greene cheese, if I may vse so grosse a Prouerbe in reproouing your so grosse an error, Neither wil these testimonies, or any of them  
conclude

conclude against the offering of the body and bloude of Christ in the daily Sacrifice of the Church, onlesse you folow your accustomed Logique in excluding one truth by an other truth. It were good for you once to remember, that one truth alwaies driueth not out an other truth, as one wedge driueth out an other wedge. Wil you thus reason, Christe was offered vpon the Crosse, and the Crosse was then the Altar (which S. Augustine alleged faith), *Ergo*, he is not offered in the Church by the Ministerie of Priestes (which Eusebius and *Oecumenius* say) and the Altars of the Church serue not to any such purpose? As wel may we thus argue, Iohn is a Minister, *Ergo*, Iohn is not an honest man. Which Argument, though perhaps it holde touching the mater, yet for the forme, I am sure you wil not allow it. This pelting kinde of Argument you vse through your whole Replie, and in manner none other. That if a learned man would examine that you write, he should finde, that neuer man wrote so loosely.

M. Jewels  
common  
Logique  
is, to put  
avvay  
one truth  
by an  
other  
truth.

Euseb. De  
Demonstr.  
lib. 1.

I doubt not good Reader, but thou lookest for a larger, truer, and apter Replie, then M. Jewel hath hitherto made to *Oecumenius*. But what could he say? No smoke can wholly take away the light of the bright Sunne. Considering his owne vnhablenes to answer the place keeping his syde vnsteined, he slyly passeth from it, as one that would faine ridde his handes of so busy a comber. *Oecumenius* speaketh most plainly and distinctly of a double oblation and Sacrifice, the one once made vpon the Crosse, in respect whereof Christe by his interpretation is not called a *Priest for euer*, the other offered vp by the Priestes continually, by whose mediation and

ministerie Christe sacrificeth, and is sacrificed. In that I terme it a double oblation and Sacrifice, I haue regard to the māner of offering: which is diuers vpo the Crosse, and in the Eucharist. Otherwise the substance of the Sacrifice, and the thing it selfe that is sacrificed, is one and the same in either. Now it had ben M. Iewels parte to tel vs, what Sacrifice is that, wherein Christ by the meane of Priestes that be now, sacrificeth, and is sacrificed, and the manner and order whereof he taught the Apostles, and consequently Priestes, in power and office of sacrificing their Successours, in his Mystical Supper. What Sacrifice this is, Christes most plaine wordes do declare. who at his last Supper, after he had taken bread, and the Cuppe into his handes, geuen thanks, broken, and blessed, said, *take, eate, drinke, this is my Body, this is my bloud, do ye this in my remembrance*. By doing which thing, and saying which wordes, he taught them the way and manner how to do such Sacrifice. by this *he taught* (as S. Ireneus saith) *the new Oblation of the new Testament*. Here M. Iewels Phrases, Metaphores, Allegories, Tropes, and Figures wil not serue his turne. Therefore he conueyeth him selfe to an other testimonie by me alleged out of S. Chrysostom, interpreting the known place of Malachie, of this Sacrifice. Wherevnto he maketh answer of as litle substance, as his other is to *Oecumenius*. And here is to be noted, that to obscure both the order and force of my Answer, he hath caused the Printer cōfusely to set that I bring in touching Malachie, together with that goeth before, that the Distinction of thinges might not appeare, which I by my new beginning of the line caused to be disticted from the former mater. Let vs heare what he saith.

Iewel.

Jewel.

This worde, Incruentum, that M. Harding hath here alleged out so Chrysostom, is thought to beare great weighe: but being wel considered, of that side, it is alleged for, as it shal appeare, it weighe nothing. The Holy learned Fathers applie that worde, sometime to Prayer, and other deuotion of the minde: and somtimes to the Ministration of the holy Communion.

For the better opening hereof, it may please thee, good Christian Reader, to vnderstande, that in the time of Moyses Lawe, the Priestes, and Leuites offered vp vnto God Oxen, Calues, Rammes, and Goates: and with the Bloude thereof sprinkled the Booke, the instrumentes of the Ministerie, the vvhole Tabernacle, and at the People: and as S. Paule saith, *Heb. 9.* In the Ceremonies of that Lawe without Bloudshedding there was no remission of Sinne. Likewise the Heathens killed and offered vp their cattail vnto their Idolles, sometimes an hundred fat Oxen in one daie. Sometime they proceeded further, and made their Sacrifices of Mannes Bloude. Erichtheus of Athens, and Marius of Rome killed, and offered vpp their owne Daughters in the honour of Pallas. The Nobles of Carthage in honour of their Idole Saturnus killed, and offered vp, lxx. of their owne male Children in one Sacrifice.

In respecte of these grosse, and Fleasbely, and Bloudy Sacrifices, our Christian Sacrifices in the Gospel, bicause thei are mere Spiritual, and proceede wholly from the harte, are called vnbloudy. Eusebius saith. Incendimus Orationis suffitum, & Sacrificium, quod appellatur Purum, non per Cruores facimus, sed per puras actiones: VVe burne the Incense of Praier: and we offer vp the Sacrifice, that is called Pure, not by shedding of Bloude, but by Pure, and godly doinges. *Euseb. De Demonst. lib. 1. ca. 6. τὴν οὐδὲ σιμάτων*

So Chrysostome, Offerimus, non per Fumum, Nidorem, aut Sanguinem, sed per Spiritus Gratiam: wee make our Sacrifices, not by Smoke, Smel, and Bloude, but by the Grace of the Holy Sprite. He addeth further, For God is Spirite, and he that adouereth him, must adoure in Sprite, and Trueth. *Chrysost. cont. Iude. os. Ora. 3.*

And



Euseb. De  
Demonst.  
lib. 2. ἀ-  
γικὰς, καὶ  
ἀναίμους  
θυσίας.  
Hieron. in  
Epist. ad  
Galat. 4.  
Cyrillus  
ad Regi-  
nas.

Cyrillus  
contra In-  
lian. li. 10

And this is the Vnbloudy Sacrifice. So saith Eusebius, Offerent illi Rationabiles, & Incruentas Hostias: They shal offer vnto him Reasonable (or Spiritual) and Vnbloudy Oblations. And the same he expoundeth, The Sacrifice of Praise.

In like sorte S. Hierome seemeth to saie, In sinceritate azima epulatur: wee feast in Purenes without leauen. In like consideration the Sacrifices, that in olde times were made vnto Fides, and Terminus, were called ἀναίμακα, Vnbloudy, because they consisted only in Suffumigations, and Odours, and were not imbrued with any Bloude. And for the like cause Thucydides calleth certaine of the Heathē oblations ἀγνά θυμῶτα, Pure Sacrifices. Likewise Cyrillus calleth the Praiers, and Melodie of the Angels, and blessed Spirites in Heauen continually praising, and glorifying the name of God, Incruenta Sacrificia:

Vnbloudy Sacrifices. Againe he saith, Nos, relicto crasso ministerio Iudæorum, præceptum habemus, vt tenue, & Spirituale, & Subtile Sacrificium faciamus. Itaque offerimus Deo in odorem suauitatis virtutes omne genus, Fidem, Spem, Charitatem: VVe, hauiug leaste the grosse Ministerie of the Iewes, haue a Commaundement, to make a Fine, Thinne, and Spiritual Sacrifice. And therefore we offer vnto God al manner Vertues, Faith, Hope, Charitie, as most sweete fauours.

For this cause the Sacrifices of our Praiers, and other like deuotions, are called Vnbloudy, for that they require no Fleashly Seruice, or Sheading of Bloude, as did the Sacrifices of the Iewes, and Heathens, but are mere Ghostly, and Spiritual, and stand wholly in the lyfting vp, and elcuation of the minde.

Euseb. De  
Demonst.  
lib. 1.  
θυσιαστή-  
ριον ἀναί-  
μων, καὶ  
ἀσκήτων  
θυσίων  
κατὰ τὰ  
καينά μυ-  
στήρια.

In like maner the Ministracion of the Holy Communion is sometimes of the Ancient Fathers called an Vnbloudy Sacrifice: not in respect of any Corporal, or Fleashly presence, that is imagined to be there without Bloudsheadinge, but for that it representeth, and reporteth vnto our mindes that One, and euerlasting Sacrifice, that Christe made in his body vpon the Crosse. Therefore Eusebius saith, Excitamus illi Altare Incruentorum, & Rationabilium Sacrificiorum, secundum Noua Mysteria: VVe erecte vnto God an Aultar of vnbloudy and reasonable, or Spiritual Sacrifices, accordingc to the Newe Myste-

rie.

ries. *Againe*, Sacrificium incendimus illi, Memoriam magni il- *In eodem*  
lius Sacrificij: VVe burne a Sacrifice vnto God, that is, the Re- *libro.*  
membrance of that greate Sacrifice. *Likewise againe*: Christus *In eodem*  
obtulit Mirabile Sacrificium pro salute omnium nostrum iubens *μνήμην*  
nos offerre Memoriam pro Sacrificio: Christe offered vp that Mar- *ἡμῶν πα-*  
ueilous Sacrifice for our Saluation, commaunding vs to offer a *ραδούς*  
Remembrance thereof, in steede of a Sacrifice. *So likewise saith* *ἀντὶ θυ-*  
*S. Hierome*, although not altogether in like respect, Pane, & Vino, Pu- *σικας προ-*  
ro, & Simplicis Sacrificio Christi dedicauit Sacramentum: He de- *σφίρειν.*  
dicated the Sacramente of Christe in Breade, and VVine, which *Hieron. ad*  
is (not a Bloudy, or loathsome, but) a Pure, and a Simple Sacrifice. *Euagrius*

*This Remembrance, and Oblation of praises, and Rendering of thanks* *August. de*  
*vnto God for our Redemption in the Bloud of Christe, is called of the olde* *Gratia no*  
*Fathers*, An Vnbloudy Sacrifice, and of *S. Augustine*, The Sacrifice *in Testa.*  
of the Newe Testament. *ad Hono-*

*Iustinus Martyr saith*, Esaias non pollicetur Cruentorum Victi- *raturum.*  
marum instaurationem: sed veras, & Spirituales Oblationes lau- *Iustinus*  
dis, & Gratiarum actionis: Esaias promifeth not the restoringe *Martyr in*  
of Bloudy Sacrifices; but True, and Spiritual Oblations of Prai- *Dialogis*  
ses, and Thankesgeuing. *cum Irya*

*S. Chrysostome saith*, Non iam Sanguinem, aut adipem offerimus *phone.*  
&c. VVe offer not now the fatte, or Bloude of Beastes. Al these *Chrysos. in*  
thinges are abolished. And in steede thereof there is brought in *Epist. ad*  
a Reasonable, or Spiritual dewtie. But, what is this dewtie that *Hebr. Ho-*  
we cal Reasonable, or Spiritual? That it is, that is offered by the *mil. 11,*  
Soule, and Sprite.

*Harding.*

What needeth al this longe processe vppon the  
woorde, *Incrumentum*, Vnbloudy? Go to the purpose M.  
Iewel. By the place alleged out of *S. Chrysostome*, it is  
euident, that he vnderstandeth *Malachies* prophecie of  
the vnbloudy Sacrifice, which Christ offered at his My-  
stical Table in his Last Supper, and is now daily offered  
by Priestes according to his Institution. Examin the

LLL

wordes

Chrysof. in  
Psal. 55.

woordes wel. See how plainly, and clearely (saith he) the Prophete hath interpreted the Mystical Table, which is the vnbloudy Sacrifice. Yet so plaine and cleare as it is, you can not see, or rather you wil not see it: And by al your witte and cunning you endeouour so to dasel the eyes of others, that they may not see it.

M. Iewell  
turneth  
al his Re-  
ply to the  
vvorde,  
vnbloudy,  
leauing  
other ma-  
ter, that  
he is not  
wel habile  
to answer

But why doo you turne al your long talke onely to the worde, *Vnbloudy*? Why doo you not aswel speake of the Mystical Table? Can ye not away to heare thereof? Say what you liste of the terme, *Vnbloudy*, and alleges so many sentences of Doctours, as woulde fil a whole booke: yet must S. Chrysostome to al men of learning appeare to expounde the Prophecie of Malachie of that whiche is vnbloudily sacrificed at the Mystical Table. What Mystical Table can ye name vs now in the Church, but that, whereon the Body and Bloude of Christe are sacrificed, whereof it is named an *Altar*, and from whens they are of the faithful receiued, for whiche it is named a *Table*? Verily this place presseth you so, that you are faine to flee as it were out of the feelde. And yet least you should seme to flee away cowardly, by long needeles talke vpon the worde, *Vnbloudy*, as it were by holding vp your shilde, you make a shewe, as though you sought stil.

*Altar.*  
*Table.*

In effecte, two things you go about to prooue. The first is, that the Sacrifice of our Prayers, and deuotion of mynde, is called of the Fathers, *Vnbloudy*. The second is, that the Ministracion of the holy Communion (which terme is very common with you) is called also an *vnbloudy Sacrifice*.

Tou.

Touching the first, you haue taken great paines to litle purpose. For it is by noman denied. Touching the second, what so euer you meane by your Ministring terme of the Ministration of the Holy Communion, we say, that the Hoste of the Mystical Table, whiche is none other, but the body and bloude of Christe, is both of S. Chrysostome here, and otherwheres of the learned Fathers, called the vnbloudy Sacrifice, not for that it representeth and reporteth vnto our myndes the Sacrifice of the Crosse, as you say (for in that respect it ought rather to be called representatiue or commemoratiue): but for that being the same in substance with that, whiche was offered vppon the Crosse with shedding of bloude, it is here offered vnbloudily. And so both these termes, *Bloudy*, and *Vnbloudy*, be referred to one subiect, or thing offered, whereby the diuersitie of the manner of offering is signified.

Bloudy,  
and vn-  
bloudy,  
referred  
to one  
subiecte.

Furthermore whereas you say, that the Christians Sacrifices be mere spiritual, and procede wholly from the harte, if you meane, that al our Sacrifices be such, and that no external thing is offered in any of them: it is vntruly spoken. For the Sacrifice of Christes body and Bloude is not so mere spiritual, that it may be said to proceede onely from the harte of the offerer, but it requireth an external action of the Minister, to wit an external pronouncing of the sacramental woordes, *This is my body &c.* Besides this, external breade and wine be also necessary, without the which this Sacrifice can not be made. And herein after that by the power of the wordes of our Lorde by the Priest pronounced, there is made the Diuine chaunge of the substance of the bread and



August. de  
ciuita. Dei  
li. 10. c. 20  
Nazian.  
in Apolo-  
getico. Thv  
Εξωθεν  
Θυσίαν.  
vvwhether  
M. Iewvel  
be to be  
trusted.

wine into the body and bloude of Christe: then is there, as S. Augustine calleth it, *the true Sacrifice*, as S. Gregorie Nazianzen termeth it, *the external Sacrifice* of the newe Testament.

Consider wisely with thy selfe good Christian Reader, whether M. Iewel be to trusted or no, in that he traueleth so much to abolish the mystical Table, the vnbloudy Sacrifice of the body and bloud of Christ, which is the most honorable and the chiefe Sacrifice of the Church. Whereas S. Chrysostom declareth diuers kindes of Sacrifices to be among the Christians, as there were in olde time among the Iewes: M. Iewel acknowledgeth al, saue that which is most worthy and chiefe. In an Homilie that he wrote vpon the .95. Psalme, he reckoneth in order ten kindes of Sacrifices, which *be sitting* (saith he) *for the grace of the Gospel*. That I may speake of the first and chiefe after that the others be accomplished, the second, is Martyrdom: the thirde, is the Sacrifice of Prayer: the fourth is, of Iubilation or ioyful synging out a loude: the fifth, of Iustice: the sixth, of Almoſe geuing: the seuenth, of Praise: the eighth, of Compunction: the ninth, of Humilitie: the tenth, of Preaching, eche one of these there he prooueth by Scripture.

Ten Kindes  
of Sacri-  
fices.

These nyne M. Iewel can finde in his harte to confesse. But the first, Satan, and he may not abyde. And that is the Sacrifice, wherein Christe him selfe is offered. Which Sacrifice of S. Chrysostom in that Homilie is called by these names. *Mystica mensa, caeleste summeq; venerandum Sacrificium: Spirituale illud & mysticum donum: hostia salutaris, salutare donum*. The mystical Table, the

Chrysost.  
in Psalm.  
95. tom.

hea-



heauenly and most honorable Sacrifice: That spiritual and Mystical gifte: The healthful hoste, the healthful gifte.

And we that should not doubt, what thing this first and chiefe Sacrifice is, with these plaine woordes he describeth it. *Est primum Sacrificium, Spirituale illud & mysticum donum, de quo Paulus ait, Imitatores estote Dei, &c.* The first and chiefe Sacrifice is, that spiritual and Mystical gifte, whereof S. Paul speaketh. Be ye the folowers of God, as beloued children, and walke in lone, euen as Christe hath loued vs, and deliuered him selfe vnto God for vs a sacrifice and oblation into a swete sauour. By which wordes he geueth vs to vnderstand, that among al the kindes of Sacrifices whiche we haue, being ten in number, as there he reckoneth, the first and chiefe of al, is Christe him selfe, who gaue him selfe to be sacrificed bloudily for vs vppon the Crosse, and nowe in the Mystical Table offereth him selfe, and is offered vnbloudily. In consideration whereof he calleth it, *the spiritual and mystical gifte, the pure, healthful, and vnbloudy hoste of the Mystical Table.*

If there were none other proufe for this Sacrifice, the onely consideration of M. Iewels dealinge with S. Chrysostome, in that he concealeth, and suppresseth the manifest mencion of it in that place, from whens he taketh testimonies for proufe of the mere spiritual Sacrifices, were yenough to persuaade a man, who is not desperately addicted to thopinions of his priuate lyking, the doctrine of the Church touching this point to be true, and M. Iewels to be false.

M. Iewels  
by false  
and crafty  
silence  
bevvraies  
erh his  
syde, and  
iustifieth  
the cas  
tholique  
doctrine.

If he would haue wrought directly to the purpose,  
LLL iij he should

he should haue prooued, that the vnbloudy Sacrifice of the Mystical Table, were nothing elles, but Prayers, Thankesgeuing, Praises, and a remembraunce of Christes Death. For we graunt, that al these doo concurre vpon that Table. But that they be there onely, that is to say, without the Sacrifice of the Body and Bloude of Christe: we denie vpon S. Chrysostomes auctoritie, who annumbreth this Sacrifice distinctly, and alone from the reste.

Againe if he would fully haue acheeued his intent, it stode him vpon to proue, that they onely are vnbloudy Sacrifices, and that this is not. For otherwise wee wil alwaies stande to this trueth, that both be vnbloudy Sacrifices, and so this is an vnbloudy Sacrifice. yea this more properly, then the other. For those mere spiritual Sacrifices be of them selues neither bouddy, nor vnbloudy, but in mere respecte of certaine external Sacrifices, whiche were offered in the olde Lawe with shedding of Bloude. But the Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe offered in the Church, is so called, in consideration of the one and the same substance, whiche once was bloudily offered, and is now offered without Bloudshed in a Myserie. In the Councel of Ephesus Cyrillus calleth it, *incruentam Sacrificij seruitutem*, the vnbloudy worship of the Sacrifice.

Ephesin.  
Cancil. in  
Epist. Cy-  
ril. ad Ne-  
stor.

Nowe good Reader wilt thou see, how M. Jewel doth alwaies like him selfe, and what smal shifte of reasoning he hath? Marke whether of the affirmation of the mere spiritual Sacrifices of the mynde, he inferre not the Denial of the external and real Sacrifice of Christes Body and Bloude: that is to say, whether he  
make

make not one trueth to put away an other truth. The thing he taketh in hande to prooue, is this. That the Sacrifice offered at the Mystical Table, is not the vnbloudy Sacrifice of the Church. Remember wthal, that his conclusion should be this, that by the vnbloudy hoste of the Mystical Table, S. Chrysostome meant not the Vnbloudy Sacrifice of the Body and Bloude of Christe. His reason then is this.

The Holy learned Fathers doo applie the terme, *Vnbloudy*, to Prayer, to Thankes geuing, to Praises, to the Melodie of Angels praying God in heauē, yea to faith, hope, and charitie, and to other vertues: *Ergo*, S. Chrysostome meant not the pure and vnbloudy offering of Christes Body and Bloude, by the Vnbloudy Sacrifice at the Mystical Table. This is the whole effecte of his prooufe, and this is his Argument.

M. Jewels  
argumēt  
against  
the vnb  
loudy  
Sacrifice  
as the Ca  
tholikes  
take it.

Let it be lawful forme that the force of this reason be opened, to vse the like forme of Argument in an other mater, that by comparisō the lewdnes of his Argument may appeare. The holy learned Fathers do applie this terme, *Necessarie*, to Faith, hope, penaunce, patience, fasting, praying, and to almoste deedes, saying, they be necessary for a Christian man. *Ergo*, the same Fathers thought not, that Charitie was necessary for a Christian man. Is not here a denial of a trueth inferred vppon the affirmation of an other truth? Right so doth M. Jewell prooue, that Christes Body and bloude is not the Vnbloudy Sacrifice of the Church, because other spiritual Sacrifices be called Vnbloudy. As thoughe the Terme might not, or were not by the

by the Fathers applied to both. Euery childe may sone espie this absurditie and follie. Bicause there is no pith in this confuse number of authorities, that be here by heapes layd together, neither prooue they any thing contrary to that we defende: I thinke it better to passe them ouer as altogether impertinent, and superfluous, then by discussing of them to be tedious vnto the reader. And that which foloweth to the ende of this Diuision, is no better stuffe then the other before. Thus he saith.

Iewel.

*This Kinde of Sacrifice, bicause it is mere Spiritual, and growveth onely from the Minde, therefore it needeth not any material Altar of Stone, or Timber to be made vpon, as doth that Sacrifice, that M. Harding imagineth in his Masse. Chrysostome saith, Munus Euangelij sine Sanguine, sine Fumo, sine Altari, cæterisque fursum ascendit: The Sacrifice of the Gospel ascendeth vp without Bloud, without Smoke, without Altar, and other the like. In the Second Councel of Nice it is written thus: Nos Christiani propemodum quid sit Ara, & quid sit Victima, nescimus: VVhat Sacrifice, or Altar meaneth, we beinge Christian people, in a manner can nor tel.*

*Hieron. in S. Hierome saith, Vnusquisque Sanctus Altare Domini in se habet, quod est Fides: Euery Holy man hath in him selfe the Altar of God, which is Faith. To be shorte, S. Augustine saith, Sacrificium Noui Testamenti est, quando Altaria Cordis nostri munda, & pura in conspectu Diuinæ Maiestatis offerimus: The Sacrifice of the Newe Testamente is, when we offer vp the Altars of our hartes pure, and cleane in the sight of the Diuine Maieftie. In these respectes our Praiers, our Praises, our Thankesgeuinge vnto God for our Saluation in the Death of Christe, is called an Vnbloudy Sacrifice.*

Hereof

Hereof the splendernesse of M. Hardinges gheasses may soone appeare. For thus he woulde seeme to reason: The Ministration of the Holy Communion, and our humble Remembrance of the Death of Christe is called an Vinbloudy Sacrifice: Ergo, The Priest hath power to offer vp the Sonne of God in sacrifice vnto his Father.

Harding.

If the Sacrifice of the Church, whereof we treat, were nothing elles, but Prayers, Praises, thanks geuing, and a remembrance, and had no substance at al, which consisteth without and besides the minde of man: then might we graunt, that al Aulters of Stoane, or Timber, were needelesse. But seing that the Auncient learned Fathers make often mention of Aulters in their Churches, and of their Sacrifices thereon: it foloweth necessarily, that their Sacrifices consisted not wholly of Prayers, thanks, and of suche other deuotion of the minde: but of some such thing also, which required a place, wherevpon it may be laid. What that thing is, Optatus that auncient and learned Bishop of Milenitum in Afrik doth declare, geuing withal an euident recorde for the vse of Aulters. Thus he saith writing against the Donatistes.

Material  
Aulters;

Optatus li  
bro. 6.

*Quid tam sacrilegum, quàm Altaria Dei, in quibus & vos aliquando obtulistis, frangere, radere, remouere? Quid enim est Altare Dei, nisi sedes & Corporis, & Sanguinis Christi?* What greater Sacrilege can there be, then to breake, rase, and quite remoue away, the Aulters of God, vpon which your selues once offered? For what other thing is an Altar, then a seate both of the Body, and of the Bloude of Christe?

An exrens  
nal Aulter  
arguerh  
the real  
presence,  
and an  
external  
Sacrifice,

MMM

These



These termes of breaking, raising, and remouing, do conuince the Aulters were material, as made of Stoane, or Timber. The vse also is expressed manifestly, which is to be a seate for the body and bloude of Christe to be laid vpon, when they be consecrate and sacrificed.

Whereof may be gathered an Argument of the real presence, and of the external Sacrifice. For a seate serueth to place real and external substances, and not mere spiritual thinges, of which sorte, contrition of harte, Praiers, thanks, and praises, are.

If I thought it needeful in this place to allege authorities for proufe of this vse of material Aulters, it were easy to allege no smal number for the same, out of the most auncient Fathers, and Councils. The thing being so cleare, and so wel known of al that haue any skil of antiquitie, it may suffice to ioyne the testimonie of S. Augustine, with that of Optatus. Who speaketh bothe of building of Aulters in Churches, whereby it is certaine they were material, and also of sacrificing vpon them. His wordes be plaine. *Nos autem Martyribus nostris non Templa, sicut Dijs, sed memorias sicut hominibus mortuis, quorum apud Deum viuunt spiritus, fabricamus. Nec ibi erigimus Altaria, in quibus sacrificemus Martyribus, sed vni Deo, & Martyrum, & nostro, sacrificium immolamus.* As for vs (saith he) we buylde for our Martyrs, not Temples, as for Goddes, but Memories (by Memories he meaneth Chappels, or Churches builded in the memorie of Martyrs) as for dead men, whose Spirites be lyuing with God. Neither do we there set vp Aulters, that on them we may sacrifice to Martyrs, but to God onely we offer Sacrifice, who is the God

August. de  
Ciuitat.  
Dei. li. 22.  
cap. 10.

Aulters  
aprouched

God bothe of Martyrs, and of vs also.

By this saying it is witnessed vnto vs, that the Altars erected in Martyrs Churches, were material, as the Churches were, and that on them Priestes made Sacrifice vnto God.

Whereas then M. Iewel admitteth none other kinde of Sacrifice in the newe Testament, than such, as for offering whereof any material Altar is not required, and S. Augustine speaketh of a Sacrifice, that is offered vnto God vpon the material Altars: by this we vnderstand this newe doctrine of M. Iewel touching the Sacrifice, to dissent from the olde Doctrine of S. Augustine. Consider wel of it Christian Reader, how safe it is for thee to forsake the Church, to contemne S. Augustine, *Optatus*, and al other the olde learned Fathers, in whose workes we finde often mention of material Altars, and the Sacrifice therevpon daily offered: and to pinne thy faith on M. Iewels sleeue, who, as thou seest, hath no sure ground, but onely denieth al, and for colour of some defence, shufflith together by heapes, patches, and peeces of the Fathers sayings, whereby a confusion is sought, no certaintie is taught.

If he wil repley against this, saying, that the Fathers cal the Altar a table (as to gete some auctoritie vnto his remouable Communion Table he is wont commonly to translate a Table for an Altar) it may please him to vnderstand, that the Fathers do truely cal it by bothe names, according to the double vse of the Euchariste, which is ministred vpon the same. For the Euchariste is bothe a Sacrament, and a Sacrifice. As it is a Sacrament, so is it our heauenly foode and sustenance: As it

Table, and  
Altar.

is a Sacrifice, so is it our daily offering. Vnto the which two vses S. Cyprian hauing respecte, saith of the bread and Chalice consecrated by solemne blessing, *that it is bothe a medicine, and also a Sacrifice, to heale our infirmities, and to purge our iniquities.* Therefore the Fathers call it a Table, in consideration we receiue from thens our substantial foode. And for that cause it is alwaies couered with a white linnen cloth. They call it an Altar, for that we offer vpon it the heauenly Sacrifice of Christes body and bloude, and for that cause also it is fastened to the place where it standeth. Wherefore the Table doth not exclude the Altar, nor doth the Altar exclude the Table. But bothe are one in deede, and yet double in respecte of the double vse of the thing wrought vpon it. So that to turne the Altar into a Table, is but a seely thifte, and a poore refuge.

This much being now knowen, it wil be easy to perceiue, that the authorities by him alleged be to be vnderstanded, either of the Altars, Sacrifices, smoke, and other Ceremonies vsed in the olde lawe, or of mere spiritual Sacrifices, which require none other Altar, than the harte of man. So is the saying of S. Chrysostome here to be taken. *The gifte of the Gospel* (whereby is meant what so euer man offereth to God now in the state of the new Testament) *ascendeth vp vnto God without bloude without smoke, without Altar, and without the other Ceremonies,* for so is it in the author. Who seeth not by these wordes, the filthy shedding of bloude, the stincking smoke, and therefore also the Altar of the Iewes in the olde lawe, to be signified? Our  
Sacrifice

Sacrifice is pure and cleane, without the smoke of burnt grease and steele, and so without that Aulter, whereon such thinges were burnt.

**B**Vt what is to be said vnto the autoritie alleged out of the second Council of Nice? *What Sacrifice, or Aulter meaneth, we Christians in a manner can not tel,* saith Leontius cited in that Council. What M. Iewel, wil you craue helpe to the ouerthrowing of Aulter of that Council, at which your selfe, and your companions do so rage and raile, as being wicked, and contrary to the worde of God for allowing the Images of Christe, and his Sainctes, and for cursing the ouerthrowers and breakers of them? I perceiue you be not so scrupulous, nor timorous, but you wil take an Apple at your ennemies hande. You are more hardy, then Laocon was, who said, as the Poet reporteth, *Timeo Danaos, & dona ferentes.*

M. Iewel  
here cras  
ueth help  
at the se  
cond Nicē  
Council,  
vvhich  
others  
wheres he  
despiseh,

*Aeneid. 2.*

Touching the mater it selfe, you ouermuch abuse your Readers M. Iewel. If euer you haue read the place your selfe, and haue not onely trusted your gatherers and serchers, you could not be ignorant, that it maketh nothing at al against the Aulter vsed in Christian Churches, but that onely it declareth, the Aulter, and sacrifices of the Paynimes, wherewith they honoured their Idols, to be now so farre growen out of vse, that the Christians skarfe knewe, what was meant by them. The wordes going before, and folowing do declare the meaning of the place. Which I thinke good here to rehearse, both for the Readers better instruction, and that your false dealing be plainly detected.

MMM iij Thus



Thus then the holy Bishop Leontius saith, writing a-  
gainst the Iewes, who charged the Christians with ido-  
latry for worshipping God, and his Saintes, before their  
Images. *Qua tandem fronte Iudai nos vocant Idololatrias?*

*Vbi nunc sunt, quae olim ab ipsis oblatae sunt Idolis, bouum, ouium,  
& filiorum quoque victima? Vbi sacrificiorum sumi? Vbi Ara,  
& profusiones sanguinum? Nos vero Christiani propemodum  
quid sit Ara, quid victima, ignoramus. Nam Graeci adulteris  
quibusdam hominibus, homicidis, impuris & scelestis templa  
dicarunt, eorumque Idola cum illis ipsis Deos fecerunt, neque  
sancti vel Prophetarum, vel Sanctorum Martyrum nomine  
Templum, aut aram appellantes.* With what face doo the  
Iewes call vs Idolaters? where be now become the sa-  
crifices of Oxen, of sheepe, and of Children also, which  
they once offered to Idols? Where is the smoke of the  
sacrifices? Where are the Aulter, and sheddings of  
bloude? As for vs that be Christians, we are wel nigh  
ignorant, what an Aulter, and what a sacrifice is. The  
Gentiles dedicated Temples to certaine men being ad-  
uoutrers, murderers, filthy, and abominable, and made  
their Images (or Idols) and them selues to be taken for  
Goddess, and yet neuer called they temple, or Aulter by  
the name of Prophetes, or holy Martyrs.

The Aul-  
ters and  
Sacrifices  
of the Pa-  
nimes, be  
vnknown  
vnto the  
Christians.

Who seeth not at the first reading, of what kinde  
of Aulter, and Sacrifices, this place is to be vnderstan-  
ded? And to speake likewise of the Christians that be  
in our time, how many be there, that in manner knowe  
not, what such an Aulter and what such a sacrifice is?  
In al England who euer sawe any such? If they haue  
not bene sene, how can they be knownen, onlesse it  
be by reading of the bookes of the Gentiles?

Neither



against the Sacrifice of the Masse. 232

Neither doth Leontius finde fault with the Gentiles, for hauing Temples, and Aulters, but for dedicating them to Idols, and not to God, and for not calling them by the names of Gods frendes, as of the Prophetes, or holy Martyrs, so as Christian people doth vse to name their Churches, Chappels, and Aulters, some of S. Marie, some of S. Peter, some of S. Paule, some of S. Laurence, &c.

Yet neuerthelesse they erecte not temples, or Aulters vnto any Martyr, but onely vnto him that is the God of Martyrs, though for the memories of Martyrs. For *what Prelate standing at the Aulter* (saith S. Augustine) *in the places of Saintes bodies, hath euer said, We do offer vnto thee Peter, or Paule, or Cyprian? But that which is offered, is offered vnto God that crowned the Martyrs, at the Tombes of them, whom he crowned, to thende that by the suggestion of the places themselues, greater affection may rise to whette our charitie both towards them, whom we may be hable to folowe, and towards him, by whose aide we may be made hable.* August. cōtra Faust. lib. 20. c. 21.

In this sense spake the Learned Bishop Leontius those wordes, not to disanulle Aulters in the Churches of Christe, for which purpose you M. Iewel haue alleged them. Neither meant he to signifie, that in his time, the name of Aulters simply and generally, had bene strange among the Christians. He meant only Idolatrie Aulters. It was guilefully done of you, to take out a few wordes of the whole saying, which being set apart, and diuided from that goeth before, and that commeth after, seme to make against the auncient custome of hauing Aulters in Christian Churches. But the whole place

M. Iewel  
falsly  
disclosed.

place viewed, it soone appeareth, how litle it serueth to your purpose, and how muche it discloseth your wicked fallshod. Where is conscience? Where is shame? If you feare not God, yet thinke, what the worlde wil say of you. But such a cause would haue no better Aduocates.

As for that you bring out of S. Hierome, what maketh it for you? Expounding this verse of the .25. Psalm, *I wil wash my handes among Innocentes, and I wil compasse thy Altter rownde about o Lorde*, maketh *Altter*, in a moral sense to signifie Faith, as handes also to signifie workes. Now saith he. *Altter* is as muche to say, as Faith. *I wil compasse (this Altter) rownde about with good workes*. That is to say, I wil not put my trust in Faith alone. I wil ioyne vnto it also good workes. *Vnusquisque sanctus altare Domini in se habet, quæ est fides*. Euery Saint (saith he) hath the Altter of our Lorde in him, that is Faith. As the real hostes, and Sacrifices, which are offered vp vnto God, are laid vpon the Altter, and thens are offered: So al our good workes, which be spiritual sacrifices offered vp vnto God, must be laid vpon Faith, as vpon an Altter, and from thens onely being offered, they be acceptable in Gods sight. For without Faith no worke is good, ne pleaseth God. Now what Argument you can gather out of this place for your purpose, I see not, onlesse it be this. The spiritual Altter, wherevpon our spiritual sacrifices be offered vp to God, is Faith: *Ergo*, there ought to be no external Altter to offer vp the external Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe vpon, which is the external Sacrifice

Hierony-  
in Psalm.  
25.

Al M.  
Iewels ar-  
gumentes  
be suche,  
as of the  
affirmas

Sacrifice of the newe Testament . But stil we answer . Your Arguments be childish, and of no force , whiche of the affirmation of one truth , conclude the denial of an other truth.

tion of  
one truth  
inferre  
the deni  
al of an  
other  
truth.

Touching that you allege here as out of S. Augustine , I doubt whether any such saying be in S. Augustine . Certaine it is, your quotation is false. And therefore it may be suspected . Albe it if he say it in some place , it maketh nothing against the real and external Sacrifice of the Church . For the spiritual Sacrifices of our hartes , exclude not the real Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe : and the pure Altars of our hartes may wel , and do wel stande with the material Altars of Christian Churches , whereon the vnbloudy Sacrifice of Christes body and bloude are offered .

Hereof then, and of that is before in this Diuision by you said, the sclenderneffe of your Argumentes doth soone appeare . For thus you reason .

The Sacrifices of Prayers, Praises, thankes geuing, and other the like deuotions , are of the Fathers called vnbloudy : Ergo , the Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe now offered by Priestes of the newe Testament, is not called the vnbloudy Sacrifice.

The best  
Argu-  
ments that  
M. levv.  
maketh  
against  
the Sac-  
crifice.

Item , By reporte of the auncient Bishop Leontius alleged in the seconde Nicen Councel , Christen people in manner knowe not , what an Altar of Idolatrous Paynimes , and what their Sacrifice is : Ergo , they knowe not what the Altars of our Churches now , nor what the dreadful Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe , is .

NNN

Item

*Item*, The Fathers speake muche of the spiritual Altars of our harte, and of mere spiritual sacrifices: *Ergo*, they denie, that there be any material Altars, and that thereon the real and external Sacrifice of Christes body and bloude is offered.

Logique is good cheape, where these Argumentes be allowed. But he that lacketh a Recorder, may yet pype with an oten reede. If Logique can not handsomly be applyed, to mainteine M. Iewels glorious Challenge, yet Rhetorique wil do good seruice. And yet in Rhetorique it selfe these Argumentes be but childish. As wel might one proue, there is none other heauen, besides our hartes, bicause S. Augustine saith, in a Sermon. *Corda fidelium*

*August. de  
Tempore.  
Serm. 44*

*cælum sunt.* The hartes of the faithful be heauen. *Ergo*, heauen that is said to be out of this worlde, is but a tale. As wel one might say, Christe is not the Sonne of God, bicause he is the sonne of man. And in a mater of lesse weight, as wel, and by like Logique, one shrewde boy might say to an other, Iacke, I wil proue thou hast no nose. Thou hast great lolling eares, *Ergo*, thou hast no nose. Of such Argumentes we haue great stoare in M. Iewels writings, and in manner none other. For which cause to any graue and learned man, he semeth rather worthy of contempte, then of Answer. Who so euer considereth, not the number of his wordes, but the weight of his sentences, not the multitude of his patched and peececd allegations, but the force of the mater by the same auouched: shal iudge no lesse. God be thanked, that hieresie hath so weake a defence.

The .15. Diuision.

The Answer.

**S** Augustin hath many euident sayinges touching this matter in his workes. One shal suffice for al, which is in a litle treatise, he made contra Iudæos, vttered in these wordes. *Aperite oculos tandem aliquando, & videte ab Oriente sole vsque ad Occidentem, non in vno loco, vt vobis fuit constitutum, sed in omni loco offerri Sacrificium Christianorum, non cuilibet Deo, sed ei, qui ista prædixit, Deo Israël.* Open your eies at last you Iewes, and see, that from the rising of the Sunne to the setting, not in one place, as it was appointed to you, but in euery place the Sacrifice of the Christian people is offered, not to euery God, but to him, that prophesied of these thinges before, the God of Israel. And euen so with that protestation, which S. Augustine made to the Iewes, I ende this tedious matter consistinge in manner altogether in allegati-  
ons, to M. Iewel. Open your eies at last M. Iewel, and see how al the holy, and learned Fathers, that haue preached the Faithe of Christe from the rising of the Sunne to the setting, haue taught this Doctrine, by worde, and writing lest to the posteritie, that they which vnder Christe doo vse the office of a Priest after

Cap. 9.

Malach. 1.

NNN ij the



the order of Melchisedek, haue not only Authoritie, but also expresse commaundement, to offer vp Christe vnto his Father.

The proufe of which Doctrine, although it depende of the weight of one place, yet I haue thought good to fortifie it with some number, that it may the better appeare to be a moste vndoubted Truthe, not moued greatly with the blame of tediousnes, where no thanks are sought, but onely the defence of the Catholike Religion is intended.

Jewel.

S. Augustine, as in these wordes he neither toucheth, nor signifieth this new manner of offeringe vp Christe vnto his Father, so in sundrie other places he openeth his owne meaninge plainly, and fully, touching the same. In his Treatie against the Iewes he writeth thus: Sacerdotium Aaron iam nullum est in aliquo templo. At Christi Sacerdotium æternum perseverat in cælo: The (Bloudy) Priesthode of Aaron is nowe in no Temple to be founde: But the Priestthoode of Christe Continueth stil (not upon any Earthely Altar, But) in Heauen. Again: The Priest offereth vp the Sacrifice of Praise, not after the Order of Aaron, but after the order of Melchisedek. Eius Sacrificij similitudinem celebrandam in suæ Passionis Memoriam commendauit: & illud, quod Melchisedek obtulit Deo, iam per totum orbem terrarum videmus offerri. Christ hath leaſte vnto vs a likenes, or Token of that Sacrifice in Remembrance of his Passion: And the same, that Melchisedek offered vnto God, wee see is nowe offered throughout the whole VVorlde. Holocausteius Imaginem ad Memoriam Passionis suæ in Ecclesia celebrandam dedit. Christ hath geuen vs, to celebrate in his Church, an Image or Token of thar Sacrifice, for the Remembrance of his Passion. Huius Sacrificij Caro, & Sanguis

August.  
aduersus  
Iudaos. c. 1.

Contr. Ad-  
uers. legis,  
& proph.  
lib. 1. c. 1.

August.  
in lib. 80.  
quæst. qu.  
61.

In eadem  
quæstione.

guis ante Aduentum Christi per victimas similitudinum promittebatur: In Passione Christi per ipsam veritatem reddebatur: Post Ascensionem Christi per Sacramentum Memoriae celebratur. The Fleashe, and Bloude of this Sacrifice before the Cumminge of Christe was promised by Sacrifices of Resemblance: The same was performed in deede in the time of Christes Passion: But after Christes Ascension, it is frequented by a Sacramente of Remembrance. Sacrificium hoc Visibile, Inuisibilis Sacrificij Sacramentum, id est, Sacrum Signum est. This Visible Sacrifice is a Sacramente, that is to saie, a Token, or Signe of the Sacrifice Inuisible. Quod Appellamus Sacrificium, Signum est, & Representatio Sacrificij: The thinge, that wee calle a Sacrifice, is a Signe, and Representation of a Sacrifice.

Augustin.  
cōt. Faust  
li. 20. c. 21  
De Conf.  
dis. 2. Sa-  
crificium.  
August. de  
Ciuir. Dei  
li. 10. c. 5.  
Nazian.  
Apologet.

Thus many vvaies S. Augustine him selfe teacheth vs, vvhāt he meante by this vvorde Sacrifice: An Oblation of Praise: A Similitude: a Resemblance: a Likenes: an Image: a Remembrance: a Token: a Signe: a Representation of a Sacrifice. So Nazianzene calleth it, Τὴν τῶν μεγάλων Μυστηρίων ἀντίτυπον: The Figure, or Token of the Greate Mysteries. To conclude S. Hierome saith thus, Tunc acceptabis Sacrificium, vel cum te pro nobis offers Patri: vel cum à nobis Laudes, & Gratiarum actiones accipis: Then shalt thou receiue Sacrifice, either when thou offerest thee selfe (vpon thy Crosse) for vs vnto thy Father: or when thou receiuest of vs Praises and Thankesgeuinge.

Hieron.  
in Psalm.  
52.

Harding.

What this man lacketh in weight, he maketh vp in nūber. If a controuerſie might be decided by a multitude of forged, peeced, maimed; corrupte, and impertinent sentences shuffed together, this mater were fully cōcluded. The Prentises, the cōmon deceiued people, the Ministers comen of late from their shoppes, and handy craftes, and others that can not iudge of these pointes, thinke perhaps, that he hath acquitted him selfe like a great Clerke,

NNN iij because

bicause they see such a number of authorities heaped together, and beholde the Margent of his booke so painted with quotations. But the wise, who haue skil hereof, whereas among so many places alleged out of the Fathers, neuer a one proueth his purpose: see wel ynough, that he is vtterly destitute of good mater, and that he onely setteth foorth an ydle shewe of wordes.

The two first authorities be not founde in the places by him quoted, which causeth suspicion. Notwithstanding the mater is not of great importance. First, what if S. Augustine say, as here he is made to speake, *The Priesthod of Aaron is now to be founde in no temple: but the Priesthod of Christe continueth stil in heauen?* If he reason thus, The Priesthod of Christe continueth stil in Heauen, *Ergo*, it continueth not in the Church: I denie the Argument. For it continueth both in heauen, and also in the Church, though otherwise there, otherwise here. In heauen it continueth, bicause he is a Priest by nature. And what dignitie he hath by nature, that hath he not losse, ne put of, by his entring into heauē. And therefore he cōtinueth a Priest there, not bypasseable renuing of his Sacrifice, but by presenting him selfe to God, and by his merciful interpellation and appearing for vs before God with that body, that was once sacrificed for vs, as S. Paule saith, *Christe is entred into heauen for to appeare now in the sight of God for vs.* Againe, *Euermore he liueth, to make sute (vnto God) for vs.*

The Priest  
hod of  
Christ cō-  
tinueth  
stil bothe  
in heauē,  
and in the  
Church.

Heb 9.

Heb. 7

His Priesthod continueth in the Church that is in earth, by the ministerie of men, that vnder him be Priestes of the newe Testament, *by meane of whom* (as Oecumenius

menius before allegeth, saith) he sacrificeth, and is sacrificed. Eusebius declaring the Prophecie of Christes euerlasting Priesthod after the order of Melchisedek, saith. *The euent (or ende) of that Prophecie is marvellous to one that considereth, how our Saviour Iesus Christe after the manner of Melchisedek doth by his Ministers euen to this time celebrate those thinges, that appertaine to the Sacrifice which is among men.* And thus your false interlined glose denying Sacrifice to be done vpon an earthly Altar, which you haue impudently added by a parenthesis vnto your Doctour, is controlled and confuted.

Euseb. de  
Demonst.  
Euāg. lib. 5  
Τὸ δὲ ἀπο-  
τέλεισμα  
τοῦ χρεσ-  
μου.

The second authoritie falsely quoted, is this. *The Priest offereth vp the Sacrifice of praise, not after the order of Aaron, but after the order of Melchisedek.* What conclude you hereof? Ergo, he offereth not the real Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe? The Argument is naught. For he offereth vp bothe the Sacrifice of praise, and also the body and bloude of Christe vnder the formes of bread and wine, and therefore after the order and manner of Melchisedek. This is very simple Logique.

If you had directed the Reader by a true quotation vnto the place, where this authoritie is written, you should haue sent him thither, where S. Augustine maketh clearely against you. And therefore of very falshod by wrong quotation you thought it policie to deceiue your Reader. The testimonie is to be founde *contra aduersar. legis & Prophet. lib. 1. cap. 20.* Where he saith thus. *Per Episcopos The Churche cōtinueth from the Apostles time to our time, and so foreward, by most certaine successions of Bishoppes: and sacrificeth vnto God in the body of Christe the Sacrifice of Praise.*

Per Episco-  
porum suc-  
cessionem  
certissimas



*of Praise. &c. For this Church is Israel after the spirit, from whom that Israel after the flesh is distinguished, which served in the shadowes of Sacrifices, by the which was signified THE SINGULAR SACRIFICE that Israel after the Spirit doth now offer up, &c. Out of this sacrifice. Israels House God taketh not Calnes, neither Goates from his hearde. This (Israel) sacrificeth vnto God the sacrifice of Praise, not after the order of Aaron, but after the order of Melchisedek.*

Yet a litle after in the same place speaketh S. Augustine more plainely of this Sacrifice. *They whiche reade doo knowe (saith he) what Melchisedek brought forth, when he blessed Abraham. And now they be partakers of it, and they see such a Sacrifice now to be offered up vnto God in the whole worlde.* He speaketh thereof, as he is wont to speake, when he commeth to this Mysterie, making this preface before, *They knowe that reade.* As who should say, This Mysterie is not to be reueled in open writing, least the despite of Infidels and Heretikes reache vnto it. but the beleuers that reade the place of Genesis, where it is spoken of, knowe what it meaneth. And they are partakers of it by receiuing the Sacrament: and see such kinde of Sacrifice to be offered now through the whole Church, that now is dispersed ouer the whole worlde. Beholde he speaketh of a Sacrifice that is receiued of the faithful, and seene euerywhere to be offered. Which argueth the same to be an external, and visible Sacrifice. Al these properties can not reasonably seme to pertain to a mere spiritual Sacrifice, but onely to the Sacrifice of the Euchariste. Thus teacheth S. Augustine there.

Touching



Touching the first sentence, if it be true that S. Augustine saith, in what ranke shal we place you, and your felowes M. Iewel? If ye wil challenge vnto you the name and estimation of the Church, by S. Augustines doctrine ye must shewe vs your continuance from the Apostles time, to these dayes, and so foreward to the ende (not by a fewe wrested, falsified, and misconstrued places of writers seming to blame thinges that ye like not, but) by most certaine Successions of Bishoppes. But bicause ye shal neuer be hable to shewe vs Bishops, that haue succeeded one after an other in profession of your strange Doctrines, from the Apostles age to this present time: ye shal not be angry with vs, but with that holy learned Father S. Augustine, if we accompte your scattered troupes, not for the Church of Christe, nor any parte thereof, but for Dennes of theeues, and Synagogues of Antichriste.

A marke  
to know  
the true  
Church,  
whiche  
these Gos-  
pellers do  
lacke.

Neither doo ye sacrifice vnto God the Sacrifice of Praise in the body of Christe, which the Church doth, as S. Augustine saith: for ye acknowledge no Sacrifice of the body of Christe at al, in whiche God is chiefly praised and thanked for his benefites.

Furthermore what Sacrifice is that, whereof the sacrifices of Israel according to the flesh, were significations, which S. Augustine here calleth *the Singuler Sacrifice*, that Israel after the spirite offereth up now? What other is it, then the Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe, after an vnbloudy manner daily offered in the Church? For of the Sacrifice of the Crosse, ye can not expounde it, bicause the same is done once already, and is not now offered vp. Neither can ye vnder-

The Sing-  
ular Sac-  
rificethat  
S. Austine  
speaketh  
of, is the  
Sacrifice  
of the  
eucharist.

stande it of mere spiritual Sacrifices, for they are not Singuler, neither offered onely now, that is to say, in the time of the newe Testament, but are common to the faithfull personnes, and times of bothe Testaments.

By this it is euident, that the Sacrifice of Praise, which Israel after the spirite, that is to say, the Church, offereth vnto God, not after the order of Aaron, but after the order of Melchisedek, as S. Augustine writeth, is the Sacrifice of the Euchariste, in whiche the body and bloude of Christe is offered vp vnder the fourmes of bread and wine, in which Melchisedek made his Sacrifice foreshewing this.

Your thirde authoritie, which you haue somedeale corrupted by nipping away certaine wordes, and by false translation, maketh for proufe of our Sacrifice, it helpeth your Negatiue nothing at al. The whole sentence truly translated, is this. *Christe hath commended vnto vs a likenes of his bloody Sacrifice (for of that he speaketh there) to be celebrated in remembrance of his Passion, to the ende we may see now that, which Melchisedek offered vnto God, to be offered in the Church of Christe through the whole worlde.* Here are touched three Sacrifices, the Sacrifice of the Crosse, the Sacrifice of the Altar, the Sacrifice of Melchisedek. On the Crosse Christe was sacrificed truly; according to the truth of substance of the thing sacrificed, and of the manner of sacrificing, which was by shedding of bloude, and killing the hoste that was to be sacrificed. In the Supper then, and in the Altar now, he is truly sacrificed, as touching the truth of the substance of the thing that is offered, that

August. li.  
83. qua.  
sion. q. 61

Three Sa-  
crifices.

that is to say, the body and bloude of Christe. For he said, *This is my body, this is my bloude, doo ye this in remembrance of me:* But not according to the truth of such manner of sacrificing. For he is sacrificed vnbloodily, and in Mysterie. The body that now is offered, is a liue body. For it is the same in the Sacrament that hong vpon the Crosse, and that is now in heauen. But though Christes body be now a lyue in the Sacrament, and the blood in the Body: yet neither is the body of vs offered, because it is a lyue, and now to be killed, nor the bloude, because it is in the body as againe to be shed: but because the body was once killed, and the bloude once shed. that, which is now done, is done in remembrance of that. And hereof it commeth, that this Sacrifice, is oftentimes called of the Fathers in respecte of the bloody Sacrifice of the Crosse (as it is in the thirde, fourth, and fifth testimonie of S. Augustine here alleged to be sene) *a likenes, an Image of that Sacrifice, a memorie, or Sacrament of memorie.* From the affirmation of which *likenes, Image, memorie, Sacramēt, representation, or figure,* to inferre the denial of a true presence and Sacrifice, is besides al rules of Logique, and reason, sithens both stand wel together. And yet this is in māner the only kinde of reason and Argument, that M. Iewel vseth through his whole Reply, and otherwheres. Which kind of Argumentes they must needes vse, if they wil vse any at al, who by opening the truth of any question by due distinctions, see their false doctrine confuted, and therefore make their apparent aduantage of confusion. Which Confusion is soonest wrought by heapes of vndiscussed authorities without declaration of the circumstances, patchedly,

and by peece meale alleged, and iumbled together, as M. Iewel is wont to doo.

Likenes.  
Ad Image,  
how they  
signifie in  
the new  
testamēt  
being  
spoken  
of the Sac  
rament.

And remember good Reader, that, whereas S. Augustine here alleged speaketh of a Similitude, or likenes, he meaneth not euery common kinde of likenes, but a likenes, that is a Sacrament of the newe Testament: Which is a holy effectual, and visible signe of inuisible grace. If thou take away the body and bloude of Christe from this likenes, it shal lacke the inuisible grace, and so shal it not be such a likenes, as S. Augustine here speaketh of.

Image.

An Image also (which terme he useth likewise) in the newe Testament considered in Christe, or his Sacramentes, doth not signifie a bare figure voide of the thing whose Image it is: But rather signifieth the true thing it selfe exhibited in the fourme of an other thing, and not in proper shape. So is Christe *Imago Patris*, the Image

De Conf.  
Dist. 2.  
Hoc est  
quod dici  
mus.

of his Father, appearing in the fourme of man. So is the Sacrament of Christes body the Image of the same body crucified, yea the body of Christe in the Sacrament inuisible, is a Sacrament and sampler of the same body visible. For so S. Augustine speaketh, *Caro uidelicet carnis, & sanguis est sacramentum Sanguinis, carne & sanguine, utroque inuisibili, spirituali, intelligibili, signatur visibile Domini nostri Iesu Christi corpus, & palpabile, plenum gratia omnium virtutum, & diuina Maiestate.*

The flesh (of Christe in the Sacrament) is the sacrament of his flesh, and the bloude is a sacrament of his bloude. By his flesh and bloude bothe inuisible, spiritual, intelligible, is berokened the body of our Lorde Iesus Christ, that is visible, palpable, full of the grace of al vertues,

and



and diuine Maiestie.

Neither maketh it ought for M. Iewel, that S. Augustine calleth this Sacrament, a *Sacrament of remembrance*. Bicause it were not a Sacrament of remembrance fitte for the newe Testament, onlesse the body and bloude of Christe were really contained therein, according to the saying of Christe, *this is my body, this is my bloude*. For we haue no warrant of the Scripture, that bread and wine, is the Sacrament of remembrance.

Sacramēt  
of remēa  
brance.

Luca, 22.

The.6. authoritie taken out of S. Augustine *de Ciuitate Dei*, is falsified by casting vnto it, this Pronoun (hoc) this. Whereby M. Iewel deceiueth the vnlearned Reader, and such as doo not examine his allegations, causing them to thinke, that S. Augustine spake specially of the Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe, whereof now we treat, whereas he spake in that place of the Sacrifices of the olde lawe, in which brute beastes were slaine. Albeit true it is generally, that *visible Sacrifice is a Sacrament, that is to say, a holy signe, of inuisible Sacrifice*.

S. Augu-  
stine fal-  
sified by  
M. Iew.

If of this place of S. Augustine M. Iewel wil thus frame an Argument against the real Sacrifice of the Church, The external and visible Sacrifice of the Church, is a Sacrament, that is, a signe of the inuisible Sacrifice, Ergo, it is not a true and real Sacrifice: The Argument is to be denied. For by like reason he should proue, that al the Sacrifices of the olde lawe were no Sacrifices at al, bicause they were (as S. Augustine in the place before mencioned saith) Sacramentes and signes of internal, inuisible, and spiritual Sacrifices.

August. de  
ciuitate Dei  
li. 10. c. 5.



Sacrifice  
of rvo  
fortes, in  
vvard, ad  
outvvard

August. de  
ciuita. Dei  
li. 10. c. 5.

Ofec. 6.

The. 7. authoritie is with other wordes reported, then S. Augustine wrote. Wherein was false meaning. The same helpeth his cause nothing at al. For Answer, this muche may be said. We are taught by S. Augustine in that place, that Sacrifice is of two sortes. the one in the reputation of man, the other in the sight of God, whiche in comparison of that other, he calleth, *verum sacrificium*, true Sacrifice. Whereas it is written (saith he) *I had rather haue mercie, then Sacrifice, none other thing is to be vnderstanded, but that Sacrifice is preferred before Sacrifice; in as muche as that which of men is called Sacrifice, is a signe of true Sacrifice. And as for mercie, it is a true Sacrifice.* Of al this nothing can be concluded, but that an outward Sacrifice, is a signe and token of an inward Sacrifice. Whereby it is euident, that one and the same thing is a Sacrifice, and the signe of a Sacrifice. Wherefore, of the affirmation of a signe or token, by good Argument the Denial of the thing, can not be inferred.

At M. Jewels Arguments faile for lacke of good logique. for stil, he inferreth the denial of one truth, of that affirmation of an other truth.

Whereas then M. Iewel impugneth the Sacrifice with this common Argument, The Sacrifice of the Church, is a similitude, a likenes, an Image, a remembrance, a Sacrament of remembrance, a signe, a token of a Sacrifice, and a figure, or a sampler of great Mysteries, as S. Nazianzen calleth it, *Ergo*, it is not a true Sacrifice; we tel him, his cause must needes haue a fall for lacke of a good Argument, and we counsel him to go to schoole againe to learne better Logique. How be it more profitable it were for him, to learne better Diuinitie.

By an example it may be made manifest, how it is bothe

both a memorie, and neuerthelesse the thing it selfe. *Paulus Aemilius* that noble man of Rome, and *C. Iulius Caesar*, and many other noble Romans, after they had achieved great victories in warre, and conquestes, were receiued into the Citie of Rome with Triumphe. Euery triumphe was a memorie, and solemne celebration of the memorie of victories by them obtained, and for memories sake of worthy and famous deedes, eche Triumphe was kept. Now what a folish Argument were this, if one had then said: This triumphe is celebrated and kept in memorie of the great Conquest, and of the Conquerour, *Ergo*, the Conquerour him selfe is not present? For at suche Triumphees the Conquerours were present riding most gloriously in their chariotes. And euery one at suche a solemnitie was bothe the Conquerour him selfe, and was there in memorie of him selfe hauing done the worthy Actes, for which he deserued the honour of a Triumphe. So in this Mysterie the memorie of Christes Passion and Death is celebrated, and Christe him selfe neuerthelesse is present, and by the Prieste offered vp to his Father.

Alleging the authoritie of *S. Gregorie Nazianzen*, calling the blessed Sacrament *ἀντίτυπον*, a *paterne*, or *sample of great Mysteries*, he hath done very falsly, in that he leaueth out of the sentence those other wordes, *τὴν ἑξωτερικὴν*, as muche to say, the external Sacrifice, for *δυστοκον* is to be vnderstanded. Of which wordes it foloweth necessarily, that it is a real and true Sacrifice. It is a signe he regardeth not so muche the truth, as he seeketh, how by some crafte or shifte, he may make an apparēt defence of his vaine Challenge.

Gregorie  
Nazianzen falsi-  
fied by  
Malevv.

Last

Last of al, the place of S. Hierome semeth to haue ben thrust in to make vp the number, and increase the heape. How it relieueth his side, I see not, onlesse he wil beare men in hande, that the Sacrifice of Praises and thankesgeuing, must in any wise exclude the Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe. Which thing when he shal make men beleue, then, and not elles, may this place of S. Hierome serue his purpose. Hitherto he hath said litle to any purpose. Now commeth he in with newe Diuinitie, and vttereth plaine heresie.

Jewel.

Neither hath God appointed any certaine order of outwarde Priesthode to make this Sacrifice. Euery Faithful Christian man hath Authoritie, to offer vp, and to make the same. Horve be it, this I meane, not of the Ministracion of the holy Sacraments, whiche onely pertaineth vnto the Minister, but onely of the Oblation, and makinge of this Spiritual Sacrifice. Thus muche I saie, least any man, either of malice take occasion, or of ignorance be deceiued. S. Cyprian saith, Omnes, qui à Christi nomine dicuntur Christiani, offerunt Deo Quotidianum Sacrificium, ordinati à Deo Sanctimoniae Sacerdotes: Al, that of Christe be called Christians: offer vp vnto God the daily Sacrifice, being ordeined of God Priestes of holines. S. Cyprian saith, Omnes, quicunque, & cetera. Al, that are bathed with the holy ointement, are made Priestes, even as Peter saith vnto the whole Church, yowe are the Chosen Stocke, and kinges. S. Augustine saith, Holocaustum Dominicae Passionis offert quisque pro peccatis suis: Euery man offereth vp the Sacrifice of our Lordes Passion for his owne finnes. S. Ambrose saith, Inuicem expectate, vt multorum Oblatio simul celebretur: VVaite ye one for an other, that the Sacrifice of many maie be offered together. S. Chrysostome saith, In Mysterijs nihil differt Sacerdos à Subdito: In the holy Mysteries (the Ministracion

Cyprian. De  
unctione  
Chrysostom.

Orig. in Le  
uit. hom. 9

1. Pet. 2.

August. in  
Expositioe

inchoata,  
ly Priesthode.

S. Augustine saith,

S. Ambrose  
1. Cor. 11.

S. Chrysostom.  
Homi. 18.

stration onely excepted ) the Priest differeth nothing from the People.

It appeareth by these Ancient Learned Fathers, that every Christian man is bounde, to offer vp the Vnbloudy, and Daily Sacrifice of the New Testament, and that in as full, and ample sorte, as is the Priest. And therefore M. Hardinge him selfe saith euen in the very Canon of his Masse, Memento Domine famulorum, famularumque tuarum, & omnium Circumstantium, pro quibus tibi offerimus, vel qui tibi offerunt hoc Sacrificium Laudis : Remember, ô Lorde, thy Seruantes, and al them, that stande aboute, for whom wee offer vnto thee, or els, whiche doo offer vnto the, this Sacrifice of Praises.

Out of S. Augustines vvordes M. Hardinge in the ende concludeth, thus : Christe is a Prieste after the order of melchisedek : Ergo, The Priest hath Authoritie, to offer vp the Sonne of God in Sacrifice vnto his Father. It were harde to tel vs, how this Antecedente, and this Consequente came togeather. Noman hath Authoritie thus to mince his Logique, but M. Hardinge.

Harding.

If the Sacrifice be external, it behoueth the Priest-  
hode also be external. That this Sacrifice is external,  
it is cleare. For to the making of this Sacrifice external  
things be requisite, as bread and wine mixte with water,  
for the mater : the wordes of our Lorde outwardly pro-  
nounced, for the forme : a Man ordered and consecrated  
into a Priest, for the Minister. The body also, and bloude  
of Christe it selfe, which is the substance offered, though  
it be spiritually vnderstanded, and not with any out-  
ward sense of man perceiued, is a real thing of it selfe  
consisting besides, and without the soule, spirite, or  
mynde of man, and may be receiued of mannes body  
by the office of the mouth, and is not a mere spiritual  
thing,

That this  
sacrifice is  
external.

PPP



thing, as loue, mercie, faith, hope, ioye, sorowe, contrition of harte, and such other things, that haue their being onely in the mynde and spirite.

For proufe that it is external by witnesss, no testimony can be plainer, then that of S. Gregorie Nazianzen, whereof the three onely later wordes M. Lewel hath three times in this Article alleged, suppressing the other with crafty silence, bicause he sawe they made directly against him. Thus he saith, *ὡς μέλλον θάρασσαι προσφέρειν αὐτῷ τὴν ἑξοδὲν (θυσίαν) τὴν τῶν μυστηρίων ἀντίτυπον?* How should I be so bolde, as to offer vp vnto him, the external Sacrifice, the whiche is the true sampler of the great Mysteries?

Nazianzen.  
in Apologetico.

Let no man charge me with falsifying this Father by adding this worde, *θυσίαν*, vnto the sentence. the same is in that place necessarily to be vnderstanded, and there it should haue bene placed expressly by the Author, but that he thought it better, the Article, *τὴν*, to haue relation vnto *θυσίαν*, thise put before in the same sentence, then by so ofte repetition of one worde, as with an vnpleasant sound, to offende learned eares, to whose good liking in that Oration, as also comonly in al his other exacte writings, folowing Polemon in his manner of writing, as it is reported of him, he muche attempered his stile.

Double  
Priesthod  
double Sa-  
crifice in  
the newe  
Testamēt.

Internal  
Priesthod.

Now as touching Priestthode, in the newe Testament it is double, internal or spiritual, and external, as our Sacrifices also be double internal and mere spiritual, and this the chiefe and singuler Sacrifice of the Church, external. The Internal Priestthode is common to al godly persons, bicause they be membres of Christe the high King.



King and Priest, and the members be partakers of what good thinkes so euer the head hath. God endeweth al with this Priesthode, whom he washeth cleane from their finnes in the bloude of Christe, consecrating and annointing them with none other oile, then with the oile of his Grace.

Of this Kinde of Priesthode speaketh S. Peter and S. Ihon the Apostle. This Pristhode as we acknowledge, so do our Aduersaries not denie. For it is neither a degree, nor order, nor office, nor ministerie in the Church. And verely this Priesthode sometimes is worthier, and of more excellencie in a woman, or a childe, then in a Bishop, yea perhaps then in the Pope him selfe. For in him it is none at al, if he happe to fal into mortal sinne. 2 Pet. i. 2.  
Apo. i. 5.

Whereas then al Christian persons be Priestes, annointed with that Ointment, of whiche S. Iohn speaketh, *Vos unctionem habetis à Sancto*, ye haue the ointment of the Holy, they ought to offer vp and sacrifice somewhat vnto God, soothly them selues, and their bodies, a *linety, holy, and acceptable hoste to God*, as S. Paul 1 Ioan. 2.  
Rom. 12.  
1 Per. 2. admonished. And S. Peter calleth the faithful, a *holy Priesthode, offering spiritual, and acceptable sacrifices vnto God through Iesus Christe.*

The other Priesthode is external or owtwarde in the Church, which is comunicated vnto certaine persons by Consecration, and by Imposition of handes of Bishops, imprinting into the soule of him that is made a Priest, a marke or Printe, that can not be put out, the like whereof is imprinted in them, that receiue the Sacramentes of Baptisme, and Confirmation. External Priesthod  
Character  
indelebilo.

Of this Priesthode so communicated by Imposition  
of handes, and ordination of a Bishop, speaketh S. Paule  
<sup>1. Tim. 4.</sup> to Timothe. *Noli negligere Gratiam, qua in te est, qua data  
est tibi per prophetiam cum impositione manuum Presbyterij.*  
Despise not the gifte, whiche is in thee, that was geuen  
thee through Prophecie, with the laying on of the hâdes  
of Priesthode. Againe to him. *Stirre up the grace of God,  
that is in thee, through the laying on of my handes.* And in  
<sup>2. Tim. 1.</sup> the Epistle to Tite. *For this intent I lease thee in Crete,  
that thou shouldest amende the thinges that want, and or-  
deine Priestes in enery Citie, euen so as I tooke order with  
thee.* S. Paule also and S. Barnabas did ordeine Priestes in  
<sup>Tit. 1.</sup> euery Church, in Prayer, and fasting, as now a daies the  
<sup>Act. 14.</sup> custome is obserued, when holy orders be geuen.

This outward Priesthode, and the ministerie of it,  
is very necessary in the Church militant. Neither be  
the Priestes depriued of it, if at any time they fal into  
<sup>Wiclef.</sup> mortal sinne, as Wiclef helde opinion, and was condemp-  
ned for it in the Council of Constantia. For this Priest-  
hode is not such a grace geuen, as maketh one accepta-  
ble, called of the Diuines, *Gratia gratum faciens*. It is an  
office, a dignitie, a Degree, and a grace freely geuen, *Gra-  
tia gratis data*, as the Diuines terme it. Neither can the  
printe, that is imprinted in a Priest, euer be put out by  
any mortal sinne.

Auctoritas  
eig to  
create  
Priestes  
lease to  
the Chur  
che.

Luca. 22.  
1. Cor. 11.

**T**hat the Church hath auctoritie and power to cre-  
ate and ordeine Priestes, of the Apostles, and that  
the Apostles receiued the same of Christe, it may  
be proued by that Christe said at his last Supper, *hoc facite  
in meam commemorationem*, Doo yethis in my remem-  
brance.

brance. For if this, whiche he bad them to doo, was a Sacrifice, as now it hath ben proued it was: then verely did he institute his Apostles Priestes, excepte we wil say, he bad them to doo, and gaue them no autoritie to doo, which were absurde. Now to make and consecrate the body and bloude of Christ, to thende we doo our Sacrifice vnto God, bicause it is aboue nature, without facultie and power from God it can not be done. And bicause our Lorde commaunded this Sacrifice to be made vntil he come, it is necessary, what leaue and power to make the continual and perpetual Sacrifice Christe gaue vnto the Apostles, that they transfused and deliuered ouer vnto their aftercomers the same, along through al times and ages. For so after the exposition of Oecumenius, and Eusebius, as it is before mencioned, the Priesthode of Christe after the order of Melchisedek is euerlasting among men.

Deriuatio  
of priest  
ly ductie.

Whereas then M. Iewel denieth God to haue appointed any certaine order of owtward Priestode to make this Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe, and auoucheth euery faithfull Christian man to haue autoritie to offer vp and make the same: though there be litle hope of good to be done with him, yet for thy sake good Reader, that thou maist see, what trusty teachers these felowes be: I wil here allege some testimonies of the olde learned Fathers for the owtward Priesthode (albe it the same is proued already bicause the Sacrifice is owtwarde) and for that this Sacrifice is to be made by those, that be Priestes by proper and special ordination, and not by euery faithfull person.

Testimonies for outward Priesthood, and for the  
Sacrifice to be made by the special  
Priestess.

Cyprian.  
de vnctio-  
ne Chris-  
matis.

**L** Et vs beginne with the blessed Martyr, and learned  
Bishop S. Cyprian, who to declare the excellencie  
of the Church of Christe that now is, aboue the  
olde Synagogue of the Iewes, that was vnder Moyses:  
among other prerogatiues numbred this for one. that  
in the Church, *Non sunt hereditariae successiones Pon-  
tificum, vel vni Leuitica tribui ministeria assignata, sed  
de omni tribu, & gente, & lingua, quos dignos & ido-  
neos Diuina probat electio, secundum vitam, non generis  
meritum, statuit Sacerdotes, quibus Calicem sanguinis  
sui inexhausta plenitudinis abundantia semper repletum  
conseruandum tradidit, & erogandum.* The successions of  
Bishops come not by heritage, neither the ministeries  
be assigned vnto the Leuitical tribe onely, but whom  
Gods election approueth to be worthy and meete, he  
ordeineth them Priestes, out of euery tribe, nation, and  
tongue, according to the desert of their lyfe, and not of  
their birth, to whom he hath deliuered the Chalice of his  
bloud filled alwaies with infinite abundance, to be kepte,  
and distributed.

Here the election of God appointing certaine spe-  
cial persons to be Priestes, allowed for worthy and meete  
in respecte of good life, not of noble parentage, the  
function and ministerie whereunto they be ordeined,  
whiche is to attende vpon the Chalice of Christes  
bloude, to consecrate, offer vp, and distribute the same  
(for



(for thus to doo belongeth to Priestes): these thinges doo argue manifestly, an outward Priesthode, and shewe as it were to the eye, that they, who be thus chosen of God, and to whom suche ministerie and office is committed in the Church, are special Priestes. For certainly, what answer so euer may be made by a wrangler touching the reste of S. Cyprians saying, the Erogation here spoken of, that is to say, the geuing and distributing of Christes bloude, pertaineth not to euery Christian man, but to him that properly and specially, and by consecration of a Bishop, is made Priest.

Erogatio  
of Christi-  
ans bloud

The holy and eloquent Father S. Leo speaking of the Priesthode of Christe after the Order of Melchisedek, geueth vs a most plaine testimonie for the special and outward Priesthode. *When the Sacrament saith* Leo. Sermon. 2. *he) of this Diuine Priesthode commeth vnto humaine functions (that is to say, when men be made Priestes) it runneth not by way of generations, neither is that thing chosen, which fleshe and bloude hath created: but the priuiledge of Fathers hauing no place, and the order of families set aparte, the Church taketh those gouernours, whom the holy Goost hath prepared: Vt in populo adoptionis Dei cuius vniuersitas sacerdotalis atque regalis est, non prerogatiua terrena. originis obtineat unctionem, sed dignatio celestis gratie gignat Antistitem. That in the people of Gods adoption, whose vniuersitie is Priestly, and Kingly (that is to say, who in general and vniuersally are Priestes and Kinges) it be not the prerogative of earthly progenie, that shal obtaine the appointing, but that he be made a high Priest, whom the heauenly grace vouchsafeth to ordeine.*



Lo to the function and ministerie of the Sacrifice of Christe that is after the order of Melchisedek, the people, whom God hath adopted and chosen for his, be not admitted, be they neuer so much vniuersally Priestes and Kinges, as the Scripture calleth them, for offering vp pure Sacrifices from the Aulter of their harte, and for ruling their fleshe, and subduing fleshly lustes vnto the spirite, which are priestly and kingly partes: neither is any of them for doing this duetie a Priest after the Doctrine of S. Leo, but onely he, whom the holy Ghoste hath prepared, and promoted to haue the speciall annointing of the external Priesthode, and so is ordeined a Priest: for elles as touching the vniuersal Annointing of the holy Ghoste, euery spiritual Priest, that is to say, euery faithfull person, hath it.

Leo hom.

3. in An-  
niuers. die  
suae Asumpt.

The same S. Leo geueth vs yet a more euident testimonie for the outward and special Priesthode in another place, saying thus: *Omnes in Christo regeneratos, Crucis signum efficit Reges. Sancti vero spiritus unctio consecrat Sacerdotes, ut prater istam specialem nostri ministerij seruitutē, vniuersi spiritales & rationales Christiani agnoscant se regij generis, & sacerdotalis officij esse consortes.*

Special  
Priesthod

The signe of the Crosse, maketh al that be regenerate in Christe Kinges. But the annointing of the holy Ghoste doth consecrate Priestes, that besides this Special seruice of our Ministerie, al spiritual and reasonable Christians vniuersally acknowledge them selues to be partakers of a Kingly linage, and of a Priestly office. Here he acknowledgeth a special Priesthode, and an vniuersal Priesthode: that, is the external, this, is the internal and spiritual Priesthoode. That, pertaineth to certaine called thereto

thereto and annointed by the holy Ghoste, this, to al in general that be faithful Christians. And though he confesse al Christians to be Priestes, yet he acknowledgeth some to be Priestes after an other manner, who be chosen and admitted *Ad specialem Ministerij Seruitutem*, that is to say, to doo a special seruice of Priestly ministerie.

This special and external Priesthode S. Augustine vnderstandeth, where he writeth thus vnto S. Hierome a Priest, him selfe being a Bisshop. *Quauquam secundum honorum vocabula, qua iam usus Ecclesia obtinuit, Episcopus Presbyterio maior sit, tamen Augustinus Hieronymo minor est.* Albe it after the rate of wordes of Dignities, which the custome of the Church hath now obtained, Bisshoprike is greater then Priesthode, yet is Augustine lesse then Hierome.

August. ad Hieronym. epist. 19.

S. Ambrose expounding the place of the Epistle to the Ephesians, where S. Paule speaketh of Apostles, Prophetes, Euangelistes, Pastours, and Doctours by Christe placed in the Church: by *Apostles*, vnderstandeth *Bishops*, and by *Prophetes*, he vnderstandeth them; that be first in degree after Bishops, *Whiche Order may now be the Order of a Priest*, saith he, meaning the Special Priestthoode geuen by Consecration of a Bisshop.

Ambros. in Epist. ad Ephes. 4.

Of this Priesthode is to be vnderstanded the .3. Canon of the .4. Councel of Carthage, in which those two hundred and fourteen Bishops, among whom S. Augustine was one, as it is certaine by his owne subscription, describe a fourme how a Priest ought to be ordered, that is, consecrated into that holy Order.

qui ordo nunc potest esse Presbyteri.

Concil. Carthag. 4. Can. 3.

QQQ

Of this

Augustin.  
lib. 2. contra  
epist. Par-  
men, c. 13.

Of this Priesthode speaketh S. Augustine writing A-  
gainst the Epistle of Permenian, where making mention,  
of Baptisme and of power to baptise, he saith thus. *Utrum-  
que Sacramentum est, & quadam consecratione utrumque  
homini datur, illud cum baptizatur, istud cum ordinatur.*  
*Ideoq; in Catholica utrumque non licet iterari.* Either (of  
them) is a Sacrament, and by a certaine Consecration  
either is geuen vnto a man, that, when he is baptized,  
this, when he is ordered. And therefore in the Catho-  
like Church either may not be iterated, or taken twise.  
For the outward and special Priesthod these fewe may  
suffice.

*That the Sacrifice is not to be consecrate*

*and made, but onely by the*

*Special Priestes.*

**N**OW touching that this Sacrifice is to be con-  
secrated, and made, not by euery faithful Chri-  
stian person, but by those that by special conse-  
cration be ordered Priestes; let vs allege the testimonies  
of some Fathers.

What force is in the worde of our Sauiour, *Do-  
ye this in my remembrance*, spoken to none but to the  
Apostles, for they onely were present at the Supper,  
if it were earnestly vrged, the learned do wel conceiue.  
But bicause these men wil not soone be confuted by  
Scripture, for that they can not be brought to take it in  
that sence, in which the Church hath alwaies bene  
taught by the holy Ghoste to vnderstand it: let vs heare  
the voice of the Church vttered by some learned and  
auncient Fathers.

*The Bishop* (saith S. Dionyse the Areopagite S. Dionysius Paulus scholer) of reuerence and Bishoply dutie, that he in Ecclesiastical Hierarchie, excuseth him selfe, in seemely wise first crying out vnto him, Thou (ô Lorde) hast spoken the worde, Doo ye this in my remembrance. If it were laufull for euery

Christian to performe this dutie, what needed S. Dionyse to speake of Bishoply dutie? Again in that he allegeth the worde of Christe, Doo ye this in my remembrance, for excuse of his boldnesse: he signifieth this office to apperteyne, not to euery faithfull person, but to that special order of men, who haue succeded the Apostles, to whom onely that worde was first spoken, that is to say, to them that be called to the special Priesthode, wherevnto Christe then promoted his Apostles, by that worde geuing power, office, and commission.

S. Iustine Philosopher and Martyr saith likewise. *The Apostles in their Commentaries* (or bookes) which are called (Euangelia) Gospels, haue recorded, that Christe gaue commaundement vnto them so, that they should consecrate this meate by the prayers of the woordes of him selfe, that he tooke bread, and after he had geuen thanks, said: Doo ye this in remembrance of me, This is my body. Item, that he said hauing taken the Cuppe, after he had geuen thanks, This is my bloude, and that he gaue it to them alone. Marke here (good Rearde) by witnesse of this blessed Martyr, who was so nygh vnto the Apostles time, the commaundement to do that whiche Christe did at his supper, that is to say, to consecrate, and offer the body and bloude of Christe, was geuen to the Apostles, and consequently to their successours (for he bad them so to doo vntil he

Bishoply  
dutie.

Iustinus  
Martyr.



come), and to none elles. Of his wordes this Argument may wel be gathered.

They onely haue commaundement to doo that Christe did at the Supper, to whom he gaue the Sacrament, but by reporte of S. Iustine he gaue the Sacrament to the Apostles onely: *Ergo*, the Apostles onely, and suche as in the function of Priesthod there instituted doo succede them, haue auctorite to doo that whiche Christe did. Now Christe consecrated his body and bloude, and offered the same, and made this Sacrifice after the order of Melchisedek. Therefore they be Priestes onely (Priestes I meane Hierarchical) that be appointed, by Christe, and haue auctoritie to consecrate, and make this Sacrifice, whiche is the point that M. Jewel here denieth, but how impudently he denieth it, any man may see, that hath eyes to see.

That this auctoritie, and ministerie, pertaineth not to euery faithful Christian man, as M. Jewel holdeth opinion, but to Priestes onely, the olde learned writer Tertullian, acknowledgeth with these wordes. *Eucharistia Sacramentum nec de aliorum manu, quam Presidentium sumimus.* We receiue not the Sacrament of the Eucharist, of the hande of others, then of the Rulers, by that he vnderstandeth Priestes.

Of this auctoritie speaketh S. Ambrose expounding this place of S. Paule to Timothe. *Despise not the grace, which hath ben geuen vnto thee through prophetic with laying on of handes of Priesthode.* These be his wordes.

*Prophetia est, qua eligitur quasi Doctor futurus idoneus, manus vero impositiones verba sunt mystica, quibus confirmatur ad opus electus, accipiens auctoritatem teste conscientia sua,*



*ut andeat vice Domini sacrificium Deo offerre.* Prophecie is, saith he, by which is chosen, as a man would say, one that shal proue a fitte teacher, but the layinges on of hande are wordes mystical, by whiche he that is chosen, is confirmed vnto the worke, receiuing auctoritie his owne conscience being witnesse, that he may be so bolde as in the steede of our Lorde to offer vp the Sacrifice vnto God.

This place of S. Paule, and the witnesse of conscience, as he saith, telleth them, who be made Priestes by lawful imposition of handes, what auctoritie they haue, and how litle they ought to be a fearde (being in them selues duly examined and approued) to offer vp vnto God the most holy Sacrifice of the Euchariste, in the steede of our Lorde.

And here is to be noted, that we make this Sacrifice, and offer it vp vnto God, not as of our selues, and in our owne persons, but *vice Domini*, in the steede of our Lorde. Christe it is that consecrateth, that offereth, that sacrificeth. He is the Priest and the Sacrifice. Neuerthelesse we, that haue receiued the holy Order of Priesthode by lawful imposition of handes, do also in our degree consecrate, and sacrifice. But how? As ministers, in the person of Christe, in the steede of our Lorde. Christ onely and alone (we confesse) is the true Priest. For by the Oblation of his owne body he onely hath done the office of the true Mediatour, and hath reconciled vs to God. And with that body he appeareth before his Father now in heauen. Wee are *vicary* *Sacerdotes*, his Vicars, and vicegerentes in this behalfe, and doo the office of Priesthode in steede of him.

In this Sacrifice,  
vwhat is  
Christe,  
vwhat are  
vwee,

Priestres  
are Chris  
tes vica  
res in ma  
making  
this Sac  
crifice.

Eusebius saith notably, that *the euent and issue of Dauids Prophecie*, Thou art a Priest for euer after the order of Melchisedek, is seene in this, that Christe persourmeth *Τὰ ἑνὰ τῶν ὑποπόνοις ἱερευσίας*, the things that belong to the Sacrifice which is among men, yet to this day by his ministers. We are but *ὑπακιστὰς* ministers, and by the mediation or meane of these ministerial and vicare Priestes, Christe sacrificeth, and is sacrificed, saith Oecumenius.

Oecumen.  
in Epist. ad  
Heb. cap. 5.

Basil. in  
Liturgia.

Vnblous  
dy, spokē  
of the Sa-  
crifice of  
the Aulo  
ter.

To further proufe hereof S. Basil saith in *Liturgia*, speaking vnto Christe. For thine vnspokeable and incomprehensible goodnesse, without any chaunge and turning thou hast bene made man, and hast ben called our hye Bishop. (*Et huius ministratorij & incruenti Sacrificij consecrationem nobis tradidisti*) and thou hast deliuered vnto vs the consecratio of this Ministratorious and vnbloudy Sacrifice. Lo he calleth this Sacrifice, the Ministratorious Sacrifice, bicause in making it we are but Ministers of our Lord, and doo his steede. Vnbloudy he calleth it, bicause it is offered vp without bloudshed, being the same that was offered vpō the Crosse with bloudshed. And here appeareth the vaine cauil of M. Iewel, who referreth the terme, *vnbloudy*, onely to the mere spiritual sacrifices of our deuotion. In offering whereof we are not only Ministers of Christe, but being endewed with grace, we offer vp such kinde of Sacrifice in our owne person.

This muche haue I thought good here to inculcate, and make plaine, the rather, bicause bothe the folowers of M. Iewel cease not to vter vnsemely and lewd talke against Priestes; saying in scorne, that *they make God*, and bicause M. Iewel him selfe in the beginning of his Replie to this Article, maketh so much a doo for that a *Mortal*,  
and

and a Miserable man should offer up the Immortal Sonne of God unto his Father. Where he saith further, that God neuer appointed any suche Sacrifice to be made by any Mortal Creature. As wel he might finde faulte with Kinges, and Iudges of the worlde, for that being mortal and miserable men, they take vpon them to rule and iudge, whereas in deede and truth Christe onely is King of al, and Iudge of al. For to me al power is geuen in heauen and in earh, saith he, *Matth. 28.* And S. Iohn saith. *Omne iudicium dedit Filio:* God hath geuen al iudgement to his Sonne.

Replie.  
page. 555.

Iohan. 5.

In the former testimonie of S. Basil, it is to be considered, that he saith to Christe in his Masse, *thou hast deliuered the Consecration of this Sacrifice vnto vs*, meaning, when Christ said, *Doo ye this in my remembrance.* Whereby we vnderstand M. Iewels general and common Priestes quite excluded. Elles let him shewe, if he can, where euer Christe deliuered power to consecrate the body and bloude of Christe, to the Laye people, that be not Priestes, but as al Christian folke in general, men, wemen and children are.

Pouer  
to conse-  
crate by  
Christ de-  
liuered  
vnto the  
special  
Priestes  
only.

S. Hierome saith writing to Heliodorus, *Absit, ut de ijs quicquam sinistrum loquar, qui Apostolico gradu succedentes, Christi corpus sacro ore consciunt: per quos & nos Christiani sumus.* God forbid, that I should speake any sinistre (or euil) thing against them, who succeeding in degree of the Apostles, doo with their sacred mowthe consecrate the body of Christe: by whom also we are Christians.

Hieron ad  
Heliodor.

Againe in his Dialogue against the Luciferians he saith, that one *Hilarinus* could not consecrate the Euchariste,

Hieron.  
Cōtra Lu-  
ciferianos

*riſte, becauſe he was but a Deacon.* If one that hath receiued the holy order of Deaconſhip, can not conſecrate and make this Sacrifice, but to doo this it muſt be a Prieſt, as S. Hierome teacheth: How ſhal we beleue M. Iewel, who telleth vs here, that euery faithful Chriſtian man hath authoritie to make it, and to offer it?

To vvhat  
ende tens  
deth M.  
Iew:ls do  
ſtrine as  
gainſt the  
blessed Sa  
crifice.

The policie of Satan, and M. Iewel, is, to abandon the external Priethode, and to ſet the lay people a worke, bearing them in hande, they haue authoritie, to make, and offer vp this Sacrifice: to thintent they may bring to paſſe, firſt, that the moſt holy and dredful Myſteries be contemned, nexte, that when there is none, that hath authoritie to conſecrate the body, and bloude of Chriſte, and to remitte ſynnes, the remembrance of Chriſtes Death vaniſh away, and the people remaine faſt bounde in the bandes of their ſynnes. Our Lorde, who came to diſſolue the workes of Satan, confounde the wicked attemptes, and damnable doctrine of Satans Miniſter.

1. Ioan. 3.

The Chur  
ches deter  
mination  
touching  
this point

I truſt ſo many as feare God, and haue care of their ſoules, in this weighty mater wil litle regarde, what he ſaith, but rather conſider, how muche ſafer it is to hearken vnto the determination of the Chuche in the great general Councel of Laterane vittered by theſe wordes.

Concil. La  
teranen.

*Hoc utique Sacramentum nemo poteſt conſicere, niſi Sacerdos fuerit rite ordinatus ſecundum clauſes Eccleſia, quas ipſe conceſſit Apoſtoliſ, & eorum ſucceſſoribus Ieſus Chriſtus.*

Mut. 16.  
Ioan. 20.

Noman can make (or conſecrate) this Sacrament, except he be a Prieſt duely ordered according to the keyes of the Churche, which Ieſus Chriſte him ſelfe hath graunted vnto the Apoſtles, and their Succeſſours. Here I haue



haue sayd yenough of the outward Priesthode, and that this Sacrifice can not be made, but by a Priest laufully ordered, and consecrated with due laying on of handes.

But whereas M. Iewel geueth auctoritie to euery faithful Christian man, that is to say, to Laye men, women, boyes, gyrles, and children (for they be conteined vnder the name of Faithful Christian men) to make, and offer vp this Sacrifice, he maketh this *Prouiso*, and putteth in as it were a *Caueat*, that it be not vnderstanded of the Ministracion of the Sacramentes, For that pertaineth, saith he, onely to the Minister, *but onely of the Oblation, and making of this Spiritual Sacrifice*.

M. Iewvs  
els prouiso.

Verely I doubte whether this Minister vnderstandeth, what he speaketh, and whereof he affirmeth. So confuse is his tale. Euery Christian man by him may make this Sacrifice. But none can minister the Sacramentes, but a Minister. I can not wel reason with him, onlesse I knewe where to haue him, what he meaneth by *This Sacrifice*, what by making, what by his Minister, what by Ministracion, what by Sacramentes. For our whole Religion by these men now turned vpside doune, and the olde termes being of them abused to signifie other thinges, then before they did: al Disputation with them must needes be obscure.

1. Tim. 3.

Concerning the Sacrifice, he nameth it, *This Spiritual Sacrifice*. If he had spoken indefinitely of Spiritual Sacrifice, euery Lay faithful person may (I graunt) and ought to make, and offer vp vnto God Spiritual Sacrifice. For besides other, a Contrite hart by report of Scripture is such a Sacrifice, that al are bounde to offer vp vnto God. But calling this Sacrifice, whereof our con-

Contrite  
harte.

R R R

trouersie



trouerſie is, ſpiritual, he ſemeth to uſe ſutteltie, and to prouide him ſelfe a ſtaring hole, if he happen to be chaſed and purſued. In reſpecte of vnderſtanding, it is ſpiritual, for that whiche is hid vnder the formes of bread and wine, with vnderſtanding it is conceiued, and is not with bodily ſenſe perceiued. But in reſpecte of the ſubſtance of it, whiche is the Real body and bloude of Chriſte, it is not properly, and altogether ſpiritual, ſpecially as Spirite doth exclude the vetitie of Body.

Affirming then that euery faithful man hath authoritie to make, and offer this Sacrifice, what ſownedeth this tale, but that euery ſuche hath authoritie to make, and conſecaate, and offer vp the body and bloude of our Lorde, whiche belongeth onely to them that properly be Priſtes, as now I haue proued?

This is bothe a Sacrament, and a Sacrifice. If none may miniſter this Sacrament, but the Miniſter (for he ſpeaketh of Sacramentes generally): how muche leſſe may any make, that is to ſay, conſecrate, or outwardly offer this Sacrifice, but he that is duely made Priſt by Biſhoply Conſecration, and laying on of handes? Outwardly offer I ſay, whereby I meane the actual, external, and miniſterial offering: For els I acknowledge, that by vowe, affection, and deuotion of harte, the faithful and godly people doth alſo offer vp vnto God this Sacrifice.

External  
oblation  
propre to  
Priſtes,  
internal  
pteineth  
alſo to  
the faith-  
ful peple.

Touchinge the testimonies here alleged, where S. Cyprian ſaith, *At that of Chriſte be called Chriſtians, doo offer vnto God Daily Sacrifice, ordeined of God Priſtes of holines*: he meaneth it of the common ſpiritual ſacrifices of our deuotion, whiche of bounden

Cyprian.  
de vinct.  
Crismat.

duetie

duetic we offer vp daily, and not of this Singuler Sacrifice, whiche, bicause it is daily offered for that we daily sinne, that a remembrance of Christes Death be renued, being the chiefe of al the Sacrifices, that we daily offer vp vnto God: the learned Fathers oftentimes haue called, *Quotidianum Sacrificium*, the daily Sacrifice.

Wherefore M. Iewel doth very vnruly, and contrary to his owne knowledge, in this place to turne it, *The Daily Sacrifice*: as though S. Cyprian had meant of this Sacrifice of the body and bloude of Christe. Of what Sacrifice it is to be vnderstanded, it is soone iudged, by that he maketh al Christians the offerers of the same. Therefore in his translation he shoulde haue called it, not *The daily Sacrifice*, but a daily Sacrifice.

The daily Sacrifice, and A daily Sacrifice.

That he allegeth here out of Origen, maketh nothing against the Catholique Doctrine touching this Sacrifice. Origen onely teacheth, whiche we also doo teache, that al good Christian folke are spiritual Priestes. Suche Sacrifices, suche Priesthode, and suche Priestes. The Christians common sacrifices be mere spiritual, for they offer vp them selues, Praises, thanks, Confession, a contrite harte, a troubled spirite, and suche other the like, whiche are mere spiritual. Of the same rate is their Priesthode.

Origen. in Leuit. Homil. 9.

Spiritual sacrifices, spiritual Priestes hod.

The peeces of sentences cut out of S. Augustine, S. Ambrose, and S. Chrysostome, as they doo nothing relieue M. Iewels cause: so doo they nothing hinder ours. And bicause they be idlely, and to no directe purpose alleged, but as it seemeth, onely to

RRR ij increase

increase the heape: it is not worth labour in setting forth the large circumstance of them to spende time, and to answer vnto them. Yet be the two last in my Reioindre to the first Article of M. Jewels Challenge sufficiently answered.

Chrysost.  
in. 2. Cor.  
Hom. 18.

M. leu. v.  
fovvly  
falsifieth  
S. Chrys.  
ostomi.

But as for S. Chrysostome, he is by M. Jewel so impudently falsified in this place, that I should iniurie the Truth, if I dissembled it. He maketh S. Chrysostome thus to say, *In Mysterijs nihil differt Sacerdos à Subdito*. In the holy Mysteries the Priest differeth nothing from the people (whereby he would perswade, that touching the Sacrifice duly to be made, beside the Ministrations, by which he meaneth only his Ministers geuing of bread and wine at the newe found communion, the priest doth no more then the people) whereas S. Chrysostome saith farre otherwise. *Est ubi nihil differt Sacerdos a subdito, ut quando fruendum est horrendis Mysterijs*. There is a time (saith he) when the Priest differeth nothing from the subiecte (that is from one of the Laetie) as when they must receiue the dreadful Mysteries.

Is there no difference, whether one say, there is a time, or place, where the Priest differeth not from the people (whiche exception negatiue manifestly includeth an affirmation of a differéce in a certaine time, or place) or generally, the Priest differeth nothing from the people? Out vpon suche shamelesse corruption.

Touching the true vnderstanding of the place, when the Sacrifice is to be receiued, whiche is the body and bloude of Christe, the subiecte, that is, any Laye person what so euer, hath as good parte, and receiueth as worthy a thing, as the Priest. For it is not now, as it was in.

Leuit. 10.  
& 22.

was in the olde Lawe (so muche S. Chrysostome saith there.) when the Prieste receiued one peece of the Beastes sacrificed, and the people an other peece, but when we come to receiue the Mysteries, we al participate of one heauenly breade, *so al is proponed* (saith he) *one body and one cuppe.*

That thus we pray in the Canon of the Masse, *Remember ô Lorde thy Seruautes, and al them, that stande aboute, for whom we offer vnto thee, or elles, who doo offer vnto thee, this Sacrifice of praise:* al this gladly we graunt. For not onely the Priestes, but also the faithfull Christian people doo offer vp this Sacrifice, whiche here M. Iewel calleth the vnbloudy, and Daily Sacrifice of the newe Testament, meaning notwithstanding thereby, not the body and bloude of Christe, but a mere spiritual Sacrifice of Praise, thinking by the name of the Sacrifice of Praise, to exclude the Real Sacrifice of Christes body and bloude, whereas none other is so muche a Sacrifice of praise, and thanks, as this Sacrifice is. Touching the Priestes, and the peoples parte in this behalfe, looke what the people doth in good affection and vowe, the same doo the Priestes in Ministerie, saith the learned Pope *Innocentius Tertius*.

Bothe  
Priest and  
people  
offereth,  
and how  
eche.

As for the Argument, which M. Iewel saith I conclude out of S. Augustines wordes, he may scoffe at it, as he list, being the inuention of his owne meery head by me not so muche as once dreamed of. It is not so harde, to tel, how the Antecedent and Consequent of it came together, as it is for him to shewe, how I haue so concluded out of S. Augustines wordes. For in this place, as S. Augustine alludeth to the Prophecie of

*Innocentius. 3. De officio Missæ. li. 4. cap. 20.*



Malachie, so of Melchisedek he speaketh not so muche as one worde. No man hath a grace to fight with his owne shadow in stede of his aduerfarie, but M. Iewel. What he meaneth by mincing of my Logique, I wote not. But verely by this, and a thousand mo places, it is now wel knowen, what a number of lyes and corruptions he hath minced and shrid together, to fil vp the Hotchepotte of his Replie.

Iewel.

*Christe onely is that Priest for euer, accordinge to the order of Melchisedek: He hath made an endles Sacrifice: He him selfe hath offered vp him selfe vnto God his Father vpon the Crosse. Therefore God the Father saithe vnto him: Thou art that Priest for euer: not any mortal Creature, or worldly vnight, but thou (onely) beinge bothe God, and man, art that Priest for euer. S. Paule saithe, VVee are made perfite, and Sanctified by that one Sacrifice once made vpon the Crosse.*

*S. Iohn the Euangelist saithe: He is the propitiation, and Sacrifice for our sinnes.*

*S. Peter saithe, He carried our sinnes in his Bodie vpon the Tree. S. Paul saithe, God was in Christ reconcilinge the worlde vnto him selfe. Therefore S. Iohn the Baptiste saithe, Behold, that Lambe of God, that taketh awaie the sinnes of the worlde, Iohn. 1.*

*Yf M. Hardinge, and his selouues doubt hereof, as they seeme to doo, let Ceriste him selfe beare witnesse to the price of his owne Bloude. Hanging vpon the Crosse, and yeldinge up the Sprite, he sealed vp al with these vvordes, Consummatum est: That is to say, This is the Sacrifice for sinne: Hereby my Fathers wrathe is pacified: hereby al thinges are made perfite.*

*Thus Sacrifice is but one: wee maie looke for none other. It is ful, and perfite, wee maie looke for no better.*

*Harding.*

Harding.

What neede so many wordes in a mater confessed? Who denieth, but Christe is a Priest for euer after the order of Melchisedek? Yea he is not *That Priest* so onely, (vpon which worde you harpe much) but that men may be Priestes vnder him, and Ministers of the same Priesthode, as before I haue proued by witnesse of Eusebius, and of Oecumenius. And S. Augustine also saith, *August. de*  
*Iam ubiq. offertur sub Sacerdote Christo, quod protulit Mel-* *Ciuit. Dei*  
*chisedech, quando benedixit Abraham.* Now is that offered *lib. 17.*  
vp euery where vnder the Priest Christ, which Melchisedek brought forth when he blessed Abrahā: whereby he vnderstandeth not only the bare figure bread and wine, but more specially the body and bloude of Christe now really contained vnder the formes of bread and wine after consecration, and then signified and forefigured by bread and wine.

True it is, no mortal Creature, or worldly wight, as you speake, is that Priest for euer after the order of Melchisedek. To what ende bring you this in? Christe also is *the Lambe of God, that taketh away the sinnes of the worlde: Ioan. 1.* He is the propiciation, and Sacrifice for our sinnes. What concludē you of al your needeles number of allegations? Whereas you say, that I, and my felowes seme to doubte hereof, you say like your selfe. The wordes of Dronkerdes, of Skoldes, and of Common Lyers, must not alwaies be taken for a sclaunder.

*This Sacrifice is but one, say you, we may looke for none other, it is ful and persite, we may looke for no better.* Is this the mater, for which you haue spent so many wordes and textes? Why sir I pray you, is there any man so farre  
an en-

an ennemie to Christe, and to his Death, that now telleth you of mo redemptions, then one? of an other Redeming Sacrifice besides that of the Crosse? of any perfiter, and better, then that? If there be any suche, let him be punished (in Gods name) to the example of al blasphemers: yea if ye wil, let him be handled as il, as ye would longer this, haue handled Bishop Boner that constant Confessor of God, if ye could haue had so much lawe there-to as ye had malice: Or as ye would haue handled me, when M. Grindal procured some of the Quenes Garde with his owne men to be sent out by nyght in al haste, vnto a place in Essex, I knowe not where, to take me, and bring me prisoner to London, being at good reste in my bed at Louaine.

Touching this point, we tel you, and this is not the first time we haue tolde it you. There is but one Sacrifice of it selfe sufficient for the Redemption of Mankind. There is but one Lambe, that taketh away the synnes of the worlde: and that one Lambe was neuer but once killed for taking away synnes. The Sacrifice that now is daily offered, in the Church, is done in remembrance of that was once done for our Redemption vpon the Crosse. We pretende not to make a newe worke of Redemption, as though that whiche Christe wrought vpon the Crosse, were insufficiēt, and vnperfit. For better declaration of that whiche we doo, S. Chrysostome demaundeth, *Do we not offer euery day? Yeas, saith he, we do offer: but we doo it for remembrance of his death. And Homil. 17, this Sacrifice is one, not many. How one, and not many? In asmucho as it was once offered, it was offered vp into the most holy of al holy. But this Sacrifice is a sampler of that, we of.*

IOAN. 1.

Chrysost.  
in Epist.

ad Hebr.

Homil. 17,

We offer up alwaies the selfe same thing. *Al the Iewes* August. 68  
sacrifices by many and diuers wayes signified the one Sacri- tra Faust.  
fice, the memorie of which now we celebrate, saith S. Augu- lib. 6, c. 5.  
stine. *After Christes Ascension it is celebrated by the* Ibid. lib.  
*Sacrament of memorie,* saith he in an other place. Item, 20. ca. 21.  
*In this Sacrifice (saith he) there is a thankesgeuing and com-* August. li.  
*memoration of the flesh of Christe, whiche he offered for vs,* De side ad  
*and of his bloude, whiche he shed for vs.* Petrum.  
cap. 19.

But you wil say, we graunt that a memorie is cele-  
brated, we denie the real Sacrifice. And we tel you, that  
the memorie or commemoration excludeth not the real  
Sacrifice. It is bothe commemoratiue, and Real. For  
there is bothe the memorie of Christes death, and the  
thing it selfe that suffered death. For prouise hereof it  
may please you to consider one sentence of S. Augu-  
stine in steede of many, that it were easy to allege. Thus  
he saith. *Iam Christiani per acti eiusdem Sacrificij memo-*  
*riam celebrat sacrosancta oblatione & participatione corpo-* Augu con  
*ris & sanguinis Christi:* The Christians doo celebrate the tra Faust.  
memorie of the same Sacrifice (that was made vpon lib. 20.  
the Crosse) now done and paste, by the holy oblation, ca. 18,  
and participation of the body and bloude of Christe.  
Lo M. Iewel, here you see it to be a memorie, and ne-  
uerthelesse the body and bloude to be offered, whiche  
are the thing, and the substance it selfe of the Sa-  
crifice.

The weakenes of your cause is suche, that onlesse  
your Argumentes procede so, as you may iustle away  
one truth by an other, you haue nothing to say: And  
thus alwaies you reason, though to no purpose, least ye  
should seme to say nothing, and so to be without al de-

SSS

fence



fence of the Doctrine, that ye deceiue Gods people withal. For if that appeare openly, ye stande in feare, least ye should lose your lyuings, your Dignities, your wiues, your wanton fleshly pleasures, and what els, I knowe, not.

Jewel.

*S. Peter saith, Christe offereth vp vs vnto God his Father.*  
*S. Paule saith, Through Christe wee haue access to the Throne of Glorie.* VVhat then meaneth M. Hardinge, thus to tel vs, and to beare the worlde in hande, that contrary wise, he hath Authoritie, to offer vp Christe, and to presente him before the Throne of Glorie? Or howe dareth he, to desire God, to receiue his onely begoten Sonne into fauour, and fauourably and fatherly to looke vpon him at his request? For thus he biddeth his praier-euen in his Canon, euen in the secretest, and deuoutest parte of his Masse. *Super quæ propitio, ac fereno vultu, &c.* Vpon these thinges (that is to saie, saith Gabriel Biel vpon the Bodie, and Bloud of Christe thy Sonne) O Lorde looke doune with a merciful, and cheereful countenance: and receiue the same (the Bodie, and Bloud of thy Sonne) (as thou diddest in olde times receiue the Sacrifice of Abel, and of Abraham (vvhich vvvas a vvether, or a calfe, or some other like thinge). Thus he, not onely taketh vpon him, to praie for Christe, but also compareth the Sacrifice of the Sonne of God vvith the Sacrifice of brute Cattail. Yf he denie any parte hereof, his ovvne Canon, his ovvne Massebooke vvil reprove him. Yf this be not Blasphemie, vvhat thinge can be called Blasphemie?

Harding.

To answer to al that is obiected, in order, first, S. Peter saith not altogether, as you reporte him. But thus he saith. *Christe once died for our sinnes, the Iuste for the vniuste, to thende he might offer vp vs vnto God.* Neither speaketh S. Paul, as you haue set him to schoole, and

and teache him to speake, but otherwise. *Adeamus cum fiducia ad thronum gratia eius, &c. Let vs go vnto the seate of his grace with confidence, that we may obtaine mercie, and finde grace to helpe at neede.* Now Sir to iustifie that you haue here said, A priest to offer vp Christe vnto his Father in the Euchariste, how can you proue it to be done contrariwise to ought, that either S. Peter, or S. Paule here saith? Thus you reason, your Allegations supposed to be iuste.

Heb. 4.

*Christe offereth vp vs vnto God, Item, Through Christe we haue accesse to the throne of Grace: Ergo, a Priest hath not auctoritie to offer vp Christe vnto God in the Sacrament.*

M. Iewels  
Argumēt.

O profoude Logique, O sharpe witte, O inuincible Disputer. Here your owne skoffing Rhetorique might wel be returned vpon you. It were harde to tel vs, how this Antecedent, and Consequent came together. No man hath auctoritie thus to mince his Logique, but M. Iewel. Why Sir, must it needes folowe, that if Christe (who, is the head of his Church, vnder which name both he, and the Church be oftentimes conteined) haue offered vp vs vnto God, that we may not offer vp Christe vnto God?

I maruel that so learned a Minister, as by purporte of your Arrogant fonde Challenge it appeareth you take your selfe to be, should be ignorant of that S. Augustine writeth notably in his tenth booke *De Cinitate Dei*: where speaking of this very Sacrifice, calling it *the daily Sacrifice of the Church*, he saith, *Ipsius Corporis ipse est Caput, & ipsius Capitis ipsa est Corpus, tam ipsa per ipsum, quam ipse per ipsam suctus offerri.* Christe him selfe is the

August. de  
Cinit. Dei  
li. 10. c. 20.

head of his body (the Church) and the Church is the body of that Head, as wel the Church by him, as he by the Church is wount to be offered vp.

Lo here you see a mutual Oblation. Christe offereth vs to God, and we offer Christe to God: so farre of it is, that his offering of vs, should exclude our offering of him. Thus appeareth the peeuishtnes of your Argument.

Of like force, and witte is the reason, if it be deduced of the other scripture alleged as out of S. Paule. For what though *through Christe we haue acceſſe vnto the throne of grace*, Ergo, may not a Priest offer vp Christe to the Father in the Sacrament? You must deuise vs a newe Logique, as you haue deuised vs a newe Diuinitie, before ye shal proue these Argumentes to be ought worthe.

*A defence of the Canon of the Masse against  
M. Iewels scoffes.*

**Y**O.V finde great faulte with the holy Canon of the Masse, vttering the spite of your blasphemous harte against it with vile termes of skoffing, as though in it the Priest desired God (for these be your wordes) *to receiue his only begotten sonne into fauour, and fauourably and fatherly to looke vpon him at his request.* And further to aggrauate the mater, you say, that *he taketh vpon him not only to pray for Christe, but also that he compareth the Sacrifice of the Sonne of God, with the Sacrifice of brute Cattle.* For proufe hereof you referre your Reader to the Canon of the Masse, and to the Masse booke, *Gabriel Biel* also for colour of your better  
credite

credite you bring in as a witnesse, who wrote vpon the Canon.

Al this is a false and a slaunderous lye. And albeit you directe your whole talke to my person, yet with the same you inueigh not onely against me, but also against al the Priestes of Christes Church, that be, or haue ben sithens the Apostles, yea against that learned and auncient Bishop S. Ambrose, who hath, and alloweth the same prayer in his booke *de Sacramentis*. And furthermore against al the holy people of God, for they specially bid that prayer, as it is expessed in the Canon (*sed & plebs tua sancta*) though the wordes be pronounced by a Priest.

For answer this we say. The Priest in the Canon of the Masse praieth not for Christe the natural Sonne of God, that God be fauourable vnto him, who can not but infinitely aboue the reache of mannes vnderstanding fauer, and loue him, of whom he said, *This is my derely beloued Sonne, in whom I am wel pleased*. But humbly he besecheth God, that he vouchesafe fauourably to looke vpon the giftes, whiche the Canon nameth, *the holy Bread of eternal life, and Cuppe of euerlasting saluation*, and to accepte them to our behoofe. And though Gabriel Biel by the same vnderstand (as true it is) the Body, and bloude of Christe, yet he expoundeth the place in suche wise, that had you euer read it, shame (if any were in you) should haue withdrawn you from making mention of his name.

Whereas the Priest besecheth God, that he with his merciful countenance vouchesafe to beholde those giftes, and take them in good worthe, as in olde time he



toke the sacrifices of Abel, Abraham, and Melchisedek, the which were figures of this Sacrifice: by this it is not meant, that the Sonne of God be receiued into fauour and be accepted of God, but that he vouchesafe to accepte and take in good worth, the Action of the Priest, whereby he offereth vp vnto him in Mysterie, Christe the pure Lambe, vnder the formes of bread and wine.

Basil in  
Liturgia.

In this sense S. Basil prayeth in the Canon of his Masse, where he saith thus. *Respice super nos Deus, & super hanc nostram Patriam, & suscipe eam, sicuti suscepisti munera Abel, sacrificium Noë, holocaustum Abrahæ, &c.* Looke vpon vs ô God, and vpon this our worship, and receiue it, as thou diddest receiue the giftes of Abel, the sacrifice of Noe, the burnt offering of Abraham. &c.

A true  
expositiõ  
of the  
prayer  
that M.  
Iouelle  
proueth  
out of  
Gabriel  
Biel. Le-  
ctione. 55.

This prayer (of the Canon) saith Gabriel Biel, Whereby God is besought to accepte and mercifully to fauer, pertaineth to the offerers. For they being afraid of their sinnes, and distrusting their owne vertue, offer vp an acceptable Sacrifice, and beseech God, that through the same they may be accepted, which they doubt not of, but that it is accepted. Wherefore they pray, that he wil accepte it, as touching the behalfe of them that offer.

S. Chrysostom in  
his Masse  
prayeth  
for the  
precious  
giftes.  
Chrysost.  
in Litur-  
gia.

That this manner of prayer seeme the lesse strange, and the lesse subiecte to the reproche and spire of Heretiques, it is to be considered, that S. Chrysostome in his Masse hath the like. Where he prayeth for these most holy and precious giftes. His wordes be these. *Pro oblatiis & sanctificatis preciosis Donis, Dominum deprecemur.* For the precious giftes offered, and sanctified,

let vs

let vs pray vnto our Lorde: Go your way nowe M. Jewel, and like an Hicke Scorne aske of S. Chrysostome, how he dareth to pray to God, for the Sonne of God. For these giftes being duly sanctified and cōsecrated by the Priest, he taketh for the body and bloud of Christ, and therefore for Christe him selfe the Sonne of God:

Vpon this place of S. Chrysostomes Masse, thus writeth Nicolaus Cabasilas the Grecian in his exposition. *Let vs pray to our Lorde for the sanctified giftes, not that they receiue sanctification (for to that ende he named them sanctified, that thou shouldest not so thinke) but that they imparte him vnto vs, that is to say, his grace.*

Cabasilas  
in exposi-  
tione Li-  
turgie.

Againe he saith there. *Oremus, inquit, pro Donis, ut in nos operentur, ne ad hanc gratiam non sit potens, sicuti quando cum hominibus versabatur hoc omnipotens corpus; in nonnullis Ciuitatibus non potuit signa facere propter eorum incredulitatem.* Let vs pray (saith Chrysostome) for the Giftes, that they may worke vpon vs, least he be not of power to the working of this grace, as this almighty Body, when it was conuersant with men, in certaine Cities was not hable to worke Miracles, for their vnbeleefe. Beware Reader thou vnderstand not this of Christes absolute power, but of the dispensation then taken in hande. For of his absolute power he was hable to worke Miracles, whether they beleued, or otherwise. Though he be hable alwaies to heale vs, and to worke miraculously with vs, yet oftentimes the riuer of his Diuine vertue, by our ingratitude and incredulitie, is so stopped from his course, that it is not powred vpon vs. Whiche I thought good to note, that thou be not deceiued.

Marc. 6.

Accor-

According to this former meaning, the Priest may wel pray in his Masse, that God wol vouchesafe mercifully to looke vpon, and to accepte those giftes, to wit, the body and bloude of Christe, that they may haue vertue to worke the effecte of grace in vs, that is to say, that the course of grace, whiche their vertue is to worke on their behalfe, be not stopped from vs, by our vnworthinesse.

And here it is to be considered, that when a condition of a sute is by secrete meaning annexed vnto a gifte presented, which most commonly happeth, the partie that presenteth it, besocheth him to whom it is presented, to receiue it with good wil, and take it in good woorth. Whiche if he professeth to doo, then the presentour trusteth to obtaine his sute secretly contained in the condition of the gifte. Now as when either by him selfe, or by an other he desireth, that his gifte may be accepted, his meaning is specially, that he him selfe making sute, or that his requeste be accepted: so in the Canon of the Masse the Priest, and in him Gods holy people prayeth, that God fauourably receiue those giftes, meaning, that they them selues, and their sute be fauourably receiued, as being a condition annexed by inward intention to their offering of the giftes. So that in this sense al hath relation to them that present and offer.

Chysof. in  
Liturgia.

And therefore S. Chysofome after that he hath said, *Let vs pray to our Lorde for the precious giftes offered, and sanctified:* forthwith addeth, *ut clemens Deus, qui suscepit ea in sancto & caelesti intelligibili Altari suo, mittat nobis propterea gratiam & donum sancti Spiritus.*

That

That our merciful God, who hath receiued them in his holy and heauenly intelligible Aulter, vouchesafe to sende vs for the same, the grace and gifte of the Holy Ghoste. Beholde Reader, he prayeth for the pretious giftes, that for them God sende his grace. What is this to say, but that he prayeth not for the giftes considered in them selfe, but for grace to be geuen to the offerers, through the giftes, and for the giftes sake? This is one sense, whereby the Prayer of the Canon is cleared of al reproche.

**A**N other sense there is, according to whiche this Prayer of the Canon may reasonably seme to containe nothing, that is absurde. For clearenes hereof this saying of S. Augustine is here to be considered. *Hoc est Sacrificium Christianorum. Multi vnum Corpus sumus in Christo, quod etiam Sacramento Altaris Fidelibus noto frequentat Ecclesia, ubi ei demonstratur, quod in ea Oblatione quam offert, ipsa offeratur.* This is the Sacrifice of the Christians, saith he. We being many are one body in Christe, whiche thing the Church also frequenteth in the Sacrament of the Aulter knowen to the Faithful, where it is shewed vnto the Church, that in that Oblation which it offereth, (the Church it selfe is offered.

The Can<sup>n</sup> of the Masse desended by an other declaration. August. de Cini. Dei. lib. 10. c. 6

In this Sacrifice the Church is offered.

Marke good Reader, in that oblation whiche the Church offereth vp vnto God, the Church it selfe is offered, bicause it offereth Christe, in whom the Church, that is to say, the number of the Faithful, is one body, he being the head, they the members. And forasmuche as the head and members make one body, that is not separated



rated: where Christe in the Sacrament of the Aulter is offered, there also is the Church offered. According to this doctrine the prayer of the Priest pronouncing the Canon of the Masse, may be referred to Christ being offered, in respect of the Church, whiche Church is offered vp whole, that is to say the body with the Head. So then thereof this sense redoundeth. O heavenly Father looke mercifully vpon these giftes, and vouchesafe to accepte them, as touching the Church, whiche is offered.

Neither is it a strange thing in the Scriptures, the wordes of Christe spoken as of Christe him selfe, to be referred to the Church, as to the whole body, yet so, as sometimes the speache be vnderstanded of the head onely, sometimes of the body only, which is the Church. For example may be alleged the wordes of the Psalme, which our Sauour Christe spake hanging on the Crosse.

*Psal. 21. Deus meus, Deus meus, quare me dereliquisti?* My God, *Matb. 27* my God, why hast thou forsaken me? S. Augustine ha-  
*August. in* uing reherfed, *Why hast thou forsaken me?* saith, *Quare di-*  
*Psal. 21.* *citur, nisi quia nos ibi eramus, nisi quia Corpus Christi Eccle-*  
*exp. in* *sia?* Wherefore is this said, but bicause we were there,  
*ne secundo.* but bicause the Church is the body of Christ? Likewise there a litle after. *Dixit utique de me, de te, de illo. Corpus enim suum gerebat, id est, Ecclesiam.* He speake thus (saith he meaning Christe) of me, of thee, of him. For he bare his body, that is, his Church. Againe of certaine thinges spoken in that Psalme by Christe, yet not truly vnderstanded of Christe, but of the Church, he saith, *Illa vox, membrorum ipsius vox erat, non Capitis.* That voice, was the voice of his members, not of the head. So the prayer

prayer of the Priest in the Canon of the Masse being referred to the Church, whiche is the body of Christ, and not specially to the person of Christe, as he is considered besides and without the Church, containeth nothing whereat M. Iewel, or any other such Scorne, can scoffe, or reprove.

Verely if there had ben any thing worthy of reprehension in those wordes of the holy Canon, S. Ambrose that auncient and worthy Bishop would not haue alleged the same, as he doth, to set forth the greatnes, and worthines of this Sacrament. Thus he rehearseth the prayer, that M. Iewel scoffeth at, as it is before set forth. *Sacerdos dicit, Ergo memores, &c.* The Priest saith: We therefore being mynde of that most glorious Passion, and resurrection from Hell, and ascension into heauen, do offer vnto thee (O God) this vnspotted Sacrifice, reasonable Sacrifice, vnbloudy Sacrifice, this holy bread, and cuppe of life euermlasting, and we beseeche and pray thee, that thou receiue this Oblation in thy hye Altar by the handes of thy Angels, as thou didst vouchesafe to receiue the giftes of thy iuste Childe Abel, and the sacrifice of our Patriarke Abraham, and that whiche thy highest Priest Melchisedek offered vpon thee.

The prayer of the holy Canon found in S. Ambrose.

Ambros. de sacra-  
mentis.  
li. 4. cap. 15

Thus appeareth bothe the auncientie, and the auctoritie of the Romaine Canon, sithens it is brought in as of good auctoritie, by S. Ambrose, as if it were a thing in his time commonly vsed in the Church, and reuerently esteemed. And therefore M. Iewel, as I haide before, your scoffes and scoffes touche not me, they touche al Priestes, the holy people of God, S. Ambrose, and the Church that was in and before his time. The lesse cause

haue I to be moued therewith, and you the more to be ashamed of your selfe, would God it were ynough to driue you to repent of suche wicked follies.

Also whereas you say in great spite, that in the prayer of the Canon I compare *the Sacrifice of the Sonne of God, with the Sacrifice of brute Cataile*: it is as false and slaunderous, as the rest of your scorneful tale is. We desire God, that he vouchesafe to accepte these giftes at our handes, as he vouchesaued to accepte the giftes, and sacrifices of Abel, Abraham, and Melchisedek. In whiche prayer, Sacrifice is not compared with Sacrifice in them selues, but Gods good acceptation of our doing is prayed for, comparable to that, wherewith God accepted the doing of Abel, Abraham, and Melchisedek in offering their Sacrifices. The

*Sicuti* (as)  
in the Cas  
non res  
porteth  
not equa  
litie, but a  
likenes.

Gen. 22.

Gen. 14.

Aduerbe, *Sicuti*, that is to say, *As*, in this prayer, as in many other places, signifieth, not an equalitie, but a likenes. God forbid, but we shoulde acknowledge and confesse, this Sacrifice, whiche is Christe, to be infinitely more acceptable to God, then the Sacrifice of Abel, were it sheepe, goate, or calfe, then the Sacrifice of Abraham, whether it were his Sonne Isaac, or the ramme, that was tyed by the hornes in the brambles, or the Sacrifice of Melchisedek, whiche was bread and wine. For there is no Sacrifice comparable to this, this passeth al. And therefore for the right construction of the Canon, we must consider similitude, rather then equalitie. suche similitude I meane, as mought be of the figure towarde the truth.

Neither yet doth the Aduerbe, *Sicuti* (as) note an equa-

equalitie of similitude or likenes, according to the selfe same degree of likenes astouching the Sacrifices them selues, but a certaine deegree of likenes, as touching the offerers. So then the sense shal be this. Accepte these giftes ô God, as thou didst accepte the giftes or Sacrifices of Abel, Abraham, and Melchisedek, whiche were acceptable to thee not for their owne worthines, but for the worthines of that Sacrifice, which they prefigured, and for the faith, and deuotion of them that offered the same, for the Scripture saith, *God looked vpon Gen. 4. Abel, and vpon his giftes*. Euen so that our Sacrifice may be made acceptable vnto thee, besides that of it selfe it pleaseth thee alwaies, let it also please of our parte that offer it, that is to say, make vs that doo offer it, by faith, and deuotion suche, as Abel, Abraham, and Melchisedek were. He that calleth this blasphemie, sheweth him selfe to be without al sense of pietie and godlines.

*Jewel.*

*But God voil answere suche a Blasphemous, & rastle Sacrificer:*  
I Know my Sonne: In him my harte is pleased. But what art thou? VVho bade thee thus to praie? VVho required suche Sacrifice at thy hande?

*Harding.*

God graunte that he accepte vs, and this Sacrifice at our handes, vntil he answer thus vnto vs. This is not, ne shal neuer be Gods answer. It is the answer of an heretique, the ennemie of God, and of the Sacrifice. God knoweth his Sonne, in him he is pleased, therefore this Sacrifice being the Body and Bloude of him, can not be to him, but of al other most pleasant. Thus

TTT iij to pray



to pray, we haue bene taught by the Apostles, their Successours, and by the Church alwaies gouerned by the holy Ghoste. If by prayer, Consecration of the Hoste be meant, whiche, as I haue shewed before, is not seldom called by the name of Prayer: the same, as the Sacrifice it selfe, we haue bene taught of Christe, who at his last Supper tooke bread, gaue thanks, blessed, brake, gaue to his Disciples saying, *Take, eate, this is my body, &c.* Likewise it is to be said of the Cuppe. By doing this, he taught vs the newe Oblation of the newe Testament, which the Church receiued of the Apostles, and offereth it vnto God through the whole worlde, as S. Irenæus saith.

Luc. 22.

Iren. lib.

4. cap. 32.

Christ com-  
maunded  
this Sacri-  
fice to be  
made.

Chrysost.  
in Litur-  
gia.

Germanus  
in conside-  
ratione  
verum Ec-  
clesiasti.

Neither hath he onely taught vs this in and by his Apostles, but hath also commaunded them, and vs their Successours in this office, to doo the same. Whiche I shewe the rather, for that M. Jewel asketh, *who requir-eth this Sacrifice at our hande.* S. Chrysostome calleth it plainely a Commaundement, where after consecration of the bloude, he saith, *Memores igitur salutaris huius mandati, &c. te laudamus, te benedicimus, tibi agimus gratias.* Being therefore mindeful of this healthful Commaundement, &c. we praise thee, we blesse thee, we geue thanks vnto thee, and beseeche thee our God. Therefore S. Germanus Archebishop of Constantinople writeth thus. *Ipse dixit, Hoc est Corpus meum, hic Sanguis meus. Ipse & Apostolus iussit, & per illos vniuersæ Ecclesiæ, hoc facere. Hoc enim, ait, facite in meam commemorationem. Non sane id facere iussisset, nisi vni inditurus fuisset, ut id facere liceret.* He him selfe said, *This is my body, this is my bloude.* He him selfe bothe gaue commaunde-  
ment

ment to the Apostles, and through them to the whole Church, to doo this. For doo ye this (saith he) in my remembrance. Verely he would not haue commaunded them to doo it, excepte he woulde haue geuen them power, that it might be laful for them to doo it.

Let M. Iewel demaunde of S. Chrysostome, who required him to make this Sacrifice, who saith thus in an other place. *In the time of the olde Testament, when Chrysost. men were more vnperfit, the bloude that they offered up in. 1. Cor. vnto Idols, God would take him selfe, that he might so hom. 24. turne them away from Idols, whiche was a signe of an unspeakeable lone. But nowe in the newe Testament he hath prepared a farre more wondrous, and honorable Sacrifice, bothe whereas he changed the Sacrifice, and also commaunded (seipsum offerendum) him selfe to be offered in place of the slaughter of brute beastes.*

Let him demaunde of S. Cyprian, how he durst to be so bolde, as to write, *Iesus Christus Dominus Deus noster, Sacrificium Deo Patri ipse primus obtulit, & hoc fieri in sui commemorationem praecepit.* Iesus Christe our Lorde and God offered the Sacrifice first him selfe vnto God his Father, and commaunded this to be made in remembrance of him. And that this Sacrifice is his body and bloude, there he declareth. M. Iewel should doo wel for his credites sake, to allege vs but one so plaine a place, as these places are, where any Catholique learned Doctour, olde, or newe euer said, that this Sacrifice is not to be made. Were there any suche, it should not haue bene kepte in silence al this while, we may be wel assured.

Iewel.

Jewel.

O M. Hardinge, God open the eyes of your harte, that you maiesee the miserable nakednes of your side. Deceiue not your selfe. Mocke not the world. Consider better of your Authorities, Of al the holy Learned Fathers, of vvhom, ye tel vs, ye haue suche stoare, ye are not yettable to shevv vs one, either Greeke, or Latine: or Heritique, or Catholique: from the risinge of the Sonne, to the Sonne goinge downe, that euer saide, as you saie, A mortal man hath Authoritie, and power, to offer vp in Sacrifice the Sonne of God.

Talk of your stoare, vvhon ye haue tried it better. Thraso wil talke of that, be barb not. And somevvhat it maie serue to fraie the simple. But the vvise vvil thinke it folie.

Harding.

O M. Jewel, God geue you a simple and an humble harte, that grace may entre. God open your eyes to see the wretched malice, wherwith your harte is fraught against the Church of Christe. Beware you continue not in this desperate minde, and purpose: least you caste your selfe, and so many as by you shalbe deceiued, into euerlasting damnatiō. If that moue you not, yet let not the fillie folie of this vaine worlde amaze your senses. Let not the pleasure of this fickle felicitie, which presently you enioye, wholly withdraw your minde from consideration of that, which is to come hereafter. Take heede, your deceiued fauourers with their light praise, and fawning flaterie, make not a foole of you. Kicke no more against the pricke: go not about to darke the bright Sunne, with smothering smokes.

Touching the Sacrifice of the body and bloud of Christe, what stoare of testimonies (whereat you cease  
not

not to (kisse) I haue brought for it, how litle you haue to say against it, and al that you haue said, of how litle pith and substance it is: al may see, that haue eyes to see. The learned, and al they that can iudge, doo see it, and consider of it, I doubt not. And that is ynough, touching my parte, and the defence of the Catholique doctrine. Would God, it were ynough also touching the holesom persuation of the people. Your selfe also now doubtlesse do see it. Yet for your worldly estimations sake, hauing made suche an Arrogant Challenge, you may not seeme to see it. At least what so euer you see, you wil not confesse your error.

Thus in ouersight to boast of sight, in darkenes to crake of light, in weakenesse to speake of strength, in maters, for whiche of your side no learning can be shewed, to challenge al men aliue: this is the parte of Thrafo. But in this Article of the Sacrifice, for which we haue so manifest Scripture, so many Doctours, so many Councils, so common, and so long continued custome, and faith of the Church, for proufe thereof to auouch the store of testimonies: it is not the parte of Thrafo, it is the confidence of him, that knoweth, how sufficiently the Catholike Religion may be defended against heretiks. This serueth not to fray the simple, as you say: it serueth to cal backe the presumptuous rashnes of a newe Gospeller, to animate right beleeuers, and to stay the simple. As for the wise, whether they wil more condemne of folle, me, for shewing iust confidence, in defence of the truthe, or you, for making suche a proude Challenge against the truth: I leaue it to their secrete iudgementes.

VVho  
playeth  
Thrafo  
his parte,  
the Challeng-  
enger, or  
Defender,

VVV

Bring



Bring vs but one plaine sentence of any Scripture, auncient Doctor, or Councel making clearly for you, that a Priest hath not auctoritie, and therefore may not offer vp Christe in the Euchariste, as I haue brought many for prouise of the contrary: and I wil be contente the name of Thraso be not returned vpon you. If ye haue none to bring, as sure I am ye haue not: for your Thrasonical Challenge, that name wil become you better then me, that (how so euer you wrangle) promise no more, then I performe.

(Christ.)  
in 1. Cor.  
Hes. 24.

That the Reader go not farre for one suche sentence among many of our parte, let the very laste, alleged out of S. Chrysostome, be considered. In whiche he saith plainely, that Christe commaunded him selfe to be offered. Whiche can not be referred to the Sacrifice of the Crosse. For if he had commaunded the Iewes to Crucifie him, they had not bene guilty of his Death. Neither permitteth the circumstance of the place, any other to be vnderstanded, then the Sacrifice of the Aulter, in whiche Christe him selfe, according to his commaundement; *Dooge this in my remembrance*, is, as I haue now proued, really offered.

If in defence of your side you can not shew vs so muche as one sentence of like clearenes, you must beare with wise men, if they thinke the great sturre you haue made with your Challenge, to be great folie. And likewise must you beare with your Aduersaries, if they reperte, you haue more shew of wordes, then substance of mater.

To conclude, go plainely to worke M. Iewel: The handling of these maters requieth honestie, sinceritie, fidelitie

felicitie, truth, conscience, and the feare of God. Set vs forth the light of true thinges, if ye haue any: leaue the darke clowdes of youy Phrases, and Figures. Conclude your Doctrine with some firme Argumentes, confirme it with good and sufficient authorities. Be ashamed of your loose and childish Argumentes, by whiche in manner alwaies you inferre the denial of one truth, by the affirmation of an other truth. Let the world see, that you allege your testimonies, truly, iointly, and wholly, that you falsifie them not by your diuisions, taking one peece here, and an other peece there, by nipping of, by adding vnto, by hewing, mangling, and, when you doo least, by wrong and wrested vnderstanding.

Otherwise if you shal continue to set maters of Faith vpon vncertaine Phrases, and Figures, and Tropical speaches, to confounde one truth with an other, to corrupte, to patche together, to mangle, and by other waies to falsifie, as hitherto you haue done: be the citations of your Bookes Margent neuer so thicke, be the number of your vnlearned and partial Fauourers

neuer so great: the wise, the godly, the lear-

ned, shal iudge you, as they finde you,

to be but a Maister of Phrases, a

confounder of Truthes, a

patcher, a mangler, a

shifter, a Falsa-

fier,

VVV

THE

# THE TABLE.

- A** Bra by M. Iewel reported to be 130.a. 143.a. 229.a. & b.  
 S. Hilaries daughter. 172.b  
 Aulters material. 99.a. 229.a. & c  
 This worde ( Al ) in Scripture oft-  
 times admitteth exception of sequent.  
 many. 168.a. b. External Aulter, argueth external  
 Sacrifice. 229.a.  
 Amalricus his carcasse digged vp, Authoritie geuen to Priests to offer  
 and burnt in Paris. 187.a. vp the dreadful Sacrifice. 88.a.  
 Anathema pronounced against the 128.a.  
 dead. 186.b. **B.**  
 Antitypon excludeth not the verie 9.b.  
 tie of the Mysteries. 80.b. Baptisme doth not only signifie,  
 Antitypon, howe it is taken in S. but also exhibit walsing of sin-  
 Clement. 81.a. nes. 83.b.  
 The terme Antitypon maketh not  
 for the Sacramentaries. 81.b. Beza. 17.a.  
 Antitypon what it signifieth pro- Beza defendeth it to be lawful, to  
 perly. 82.b. put Heretiques to death. 179.a.  
 Apostles made Priestes by Christ at  
 the last Supper. 87.a. b. & in The Bible corrupted by the Prote-  
 sequent. stantes. 167.a. b.  
 The Apostles made vowe to for- Bishoply due tie. 246.a.  
 sake al thinges. 171.b. Bloudy, and vnbloudy referred to  
 The Apostles forsoke the companie one subiect. 226.a.  
 of their wiues. Ibidem. Burning of Heretiques Dead car-  
 Application of Christes Death no casses no newe thing. 126.b. & c  
 strange Doctrine. 219.a. sequent.  
 Application of this Sacrifice proo-  
 ued. 114.b. 121.a. 162.a. b. 219.a. **C.**  
 Aulters vsed of the Christians. 9.a.  
 b. 99.a. **C**Aluine defendeth it lawful to put  
 Aulter. 61.a. 130.a. 225.b. 230.a. Heretiques to Death. 197.a.  
 Aulter visible and external. 60.b. The Canon of the Masse defended  
 against M. Iewels scoffes. 123. b.  
 254.b. 257.a.  
 The prayer of the holy Canō found  
 in S.



# THE TABLE.

in S. Ambrose. 238.a.  
 Ceremonies of the Jewes changed. 238.a.  
 9.a. & sequent.  
 Ceremonies of the Christians. 591.a.  
 The Challengr playeth Thraſo his parte. 261.b.  
 How we ſee Chriſte ſuffering by Charitie. 200.b.  
 Chriſte truly and in deede offered. 35.a.  
 Chriſt offered vp his body at his laſt Supper. 45.a. 48.a.  
 Chriſt ſacrificed him ſelfe at his Supper. 67.b. 79.b. & ſequent.  
 Chriſte gaue his body; and ſhed his bloud at the Supper; affirmed by certaine Fathers. 73.a.  
 Chriſte ſacrificeth, and is ſacrificed, by the meanes or mediation of Priſtes. 84.a. 127.a.  
 Chriſte dieth againe in this Myſterie, and how. 161.b. 162.a.  
 Chriſt at the Supper both Priſt, and Lambe. 73.b.  
 Chriſt commaunded him ſelfe to be offered. 79.b. 106.b. 159.b.  
 Chriſte appeareth before the Faſher in heauen with his wounded body. 117.a. 118.a.  
 The Roſke was Chriſte; and how. 137.a.  
 Chriſtes being in the Sacrifice, and in reading of the ſtorie of the Goſpel is different. 139.a.  
 Chriſte offered the true bread, and the

true wine at his Supper. 48.a.  
 204.a.  
 Chriſte, conſecrated his body and bloud at his Supper. 133.a.  
 The Churche ſpeaketh with al tongues. 209.b.  
 The Churche beholdeth Chriſt and toucheth his woundes. 200.b.  
 A marke to know the true Church, which the Goſpellers lacke. 237.a.  
 The Churche hath authoritie to create Priſtes. 242.b.  
 The Churches determination touching the conſecration of the Sacrament. 248.a.  
 Moſt inſolent madnes to cal in queſtion thinges generally receiued in the Catholike Churche. 123.a.  
 Commemoration, example, and ſigne, exclude not the real preſence, and real oblation. 28.a.  
 97.b. 98.a. 253.a.  
 Commemoration and the hoſte different. 124.b.  
 Communion of England compared with Melchizedeks Sacrifice, which M. Iew. calleth Melchizedeks Maſſe. 211.b.  
 Concluſions out of S. Chryſoſtome againſt M. Iewel. 152.a. & b. 153.b.  
 Contrite harte a Sacrifice. 249.a.  
 Craymors, and his ſubſcriptions. 211.b.  
 Crucifying of Chriſte conſidered two waies. 219.a.  
 VVV. ij. Date,



# THE TABLE.

**D** Dare, vsed for, offerre. 69.a.

The Daily Sacrifice, and a Daily Sacrifice. 250.a.

Dauid Georges carkasse digged vp and burnt with his image at Bafle. 187.a.

Dedication, what thereby is meant in S. Hierome. 213.a.

Dicke Adams hanged at Bristowe for felonie, Foxes Martyr. 181.a.

E.

**E** Mamuel the Iewes euangelical wedlocke to an other mans wyfe. 175.a.

The Euchariste maketh our bodies immortal. 84.b. 150.a.

The Euchariste what it is. 83..b. & sequent.

The Euchariste consisteth of two thinges. 150.a.

The Eucharist is the Singular Sacrifice. 237.a.

External Sacrifice. 138.a. & b. 229.a. 241.a.

External Priestthod. 242.a.

External Oblation proper to Priestes. 249.b.

F.

**H**owe we see Christes woundes by Faith. 180.a.

The Faith of the Fathers of the old Testament, and ours, remaneth one and the same. 245.a.

Either the Fathers were deceived,

or the holy Ghoste dissenteth fro him selfe. 7.b.

Falsifiers practise. 57.a.

The holy learned Fathers tale to M.Iewel and his felowes. 188.a.

Figure onely, excluded. 197.b.

Foxes holy Martyrs. 181.a.

G.

The fable of the Garnsey woman burnt for heresie. 184.a.

Of the woman of Garnseys childe falling out of her bely into the fier. 184.b.

Germane Compar, what thereby is meant in S. Paule. 167.b.

Gospel, what it signifieth sometimes. 213.a.

H.

**H**eretiques robbe the Church of the greatest Treasure. 44.a.b.

Heretikes punished by death. 178.b. & sequent.

Heretikes scourged with rodde, an olde punishment. 183.a.

Heretikes tongues cut out, an olde punishment. 183.b.

Holste and vnbluddy ioyned together. 77.b.

I.

M.Iewels obiect is against the sacrifice taken of the basenesse of mankind, andweredi guidede 14a

M.Iewel to proue his Negative, at the first findeth no antienter doctour, then Theophylacte, a late

# THE TABLE.

late written, *15. a*

M. Jewel maketh the Fathers to speake one thing and thinke another. *8. b*

M. Jewel excluded out of the number of Catholiques by Leo, his judgement. *10. b*

M. Jewels reason, why Priesthood, Altars, sacrifice, and such other termes, were vsed of the Fathers, reproved. *10. b. 11. a*

M. Jewel vtterly taketh away the real sacrifice of the new testamēt. *22. b*

M. Jewel maketh it a dāgerous pre-sūptiō, that a Priest hath auctoritie to offer vp Christ vnto his Father. *49. a*

M. Jewel like to false Lapidaries and goldsmithes. *54. b*

M. Jewels Custome, for aduantage against his Aduersarie. *65. a*

M. Jewel straggleth alone like a lost sheepe. *68. a*

That absurde to M. Jewel, which S. Chrysostome, Gregorie Nazianzen, Theophylact, and the holy Fathers alowe. *77. b. 78. a*

M. Jewel skanneth Diuinitie by Phrases. *77. b*

Scorneful termes vsed by M. Jewel. *86. 87.*

M. Jewels Greeke friend of Oxford trusted of him to much. *99. b*

M. Jewels scorneful absurditie of

one and two, once and twise, answered. *115. a*

M. Jewels argument absurd. *16. a. 228. a. 254. a. fende. 136. b. forged. 68. b. 207. b.*

M. Jew. falsifieth S. Chrysostom. *17. b. 38. b. 70. b. 89. b. 151. a. b. 250. b*

M. Jewels shiftes against the Sacrifice. *19. b. 155. b.*

M. Jewels diuerting from the purpose to impertinent matter. *19. b. 137. b. 142. a. 165. b. 166. b. 176. b. 225. b.*

M. Jew. forgeth sayings of his own, fathering the vpon the Doctours. *24. b. 34. a. 53. b. 54. b. 142. a. 200. a. 202. a.*

M. Jew. laboureth to proue, that the thing and substance of the Sacramentes of both Testamentes, be not sundry, but one. *24. a. b.*

M. Jewel changeth the Doctours wordes. *32. a. 111. a. 239. b.*

M. Jewel taketh aduantage of his owne false translation. *38. a.*

M. Jew. faineth his Aduersarie to say that he saith not, and therto directeth his Replie. *43. b. 101. a. 126. a*

M. Jew. falsifieth S. Augustine. *32. a. 38. a. 39. a. 239. a.*

M. Jewel falsifieth S. Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus. *33. b.*

M. Jewels falshod plainly detected. *34. b. 71. b. 232. a.*

M. I. falsifieth the cōcil of Nice. *37. a*  
M. Ievv.

## THE TABLE.

M. Iewel forgeth a laying of his  
owne, and putteth it vpon Ter-  
tullian. 53.b.

M. Iewel falsifieth S. Hierom. 57.b.

M. Iewel falsifieth Eusebius. 59.b.  
92.b.

M. Iewel falsifieth S. Thomas in Ca-  
tena Aurea. 71.a. & b.

M. Iewel taken in a foule contradi-  
ction. 80.b.

M. Iewel corrupteth S. Clement.  
48.a.

M. Iewels guileful dealing. 100.a.  
139.a. 150.b. 163.b.

M. Iewels howes and Ifs, whome  
they become. 76.a.

M. Iew. falsifieth the woordes of the  
answer. 66.a. 75.b. 118.a.

M. Iewel addeth of his owne. 57.a.

M. Iewel falsly reporteth the Aun-  
swer, where it is said inuisibly of-  
fered, he saith, inuisibly sacrificed  
116.a. 118.b.

M. Iewel a begyler of the simple, a  
mocker of the world, a control-  
ler of S. Ambrose, and a condem-  
ner of the whole Church. 125.a.

M. Iew. allegeth the wordes of the  
Authours, of which none be ex-  
tant bearing the same title. 17.b.

M. Iewel vseth false translation. 17.b.  
18.a. 37.a. 40.a. 98.a. 114.b. 177.b.  
195.b. 204.a.

M. Iewel swarveth from the mea-  
ning of the Fathers. 54.a. 90.a.

M. Iewel concealeth the circum-  
stances of places alleged. 57.a.

102.b. 145.a. 149.b. 193.b. 211.a.  
227.a. b. 231.b. 241.b.

M. Iewel findeth contradiction  
where none is. 167.a.

M. Iewel dissembleth truthes (as the  
Real presence) found in the Au-  
thours. 72.a.

M. Iewvel laboureth to put the Fa-  
thers out of credit, and to that end  
vseth light termes. 79.a. 110.a. b.

M. Iewvel taketh the beginning of a  
Sentence, and cutteth away the  
ende. 111.a. b.

M. Iewvel deuiseeth impudent glosses,  
and setteth them in by way of a  
Parenthesis. 112.b.

M. Iewel reporteth the Canon of  
the Masse falsly, to colourable ad-  
uantage. 123.a. b.

M. Iewels doctrine only figuratiue.  
103.a. 218.a.

M. Iewel falsifieth S. Cyprian. 111.a.

M. Iewels cosse. 112.b.

A Common Thiste of M. Iewels  
Rhetorique. 129.a.

M. Iewel falsifieth S. Dionyse. 130.a.

M. Iew. falsifieth Pachymeres. 136.a.

M. Iewel falsifieth S. Gregorie Nazi-  
anzen. 138.a. 240.a.

M. Iewvels Logique. 139.a. 239.b.

M. Iewel falsifieth Martialis. 143.a.

M. Iewel falsifieth S. Irenaeus. 146.a.  
& b. 149.a.

M. Iew.

# THE TABLE.

M. Iew. must yeelde by reason. 153. a

M. Iewels open subscription at Oxford. 182. b.

M. Iewels wrangling. 193. a.

M. Iew. falsifieth S. Ambrose. 198. a

How M. Ievv. acknowlegeth Christes presence in the b. Sacrament.

199. b. & sequent.

M. Iew. nipping of sentēces. 211. a.

M. Iewel speaketh directly against his owne knowvledge touching Oecumenius. 215. b

M. Ievvel dissembleth great pointes in Oecumenius. 217. b. & seq.

M. Ievvel vttereth manifest heresie. 221. a. & sequent.

M. Ievvels promise in his last Sermō at Paules Crosse. 222. b

M. Ievvels trustines. 226. b

M. Ievvel by his false and crafty sentence iustificieth the Catholique Doctrine. 227. a

M. Ievvel craueth helpe at the secōd Nicen Council, whiche otherwheres he despiseth. 231. a

M. Ievvels best Argumentes against the Sacrifice. 233. a

M. Ievv. ioyneth together woordes that be thirty lynes a sunder, and thereof frameth a sense to his owne purpose. 146. a

M. Iew. maketh false gloses, and additions, and setteth them foorth with that letter, in which the doctors sayings be printed. 146. a. b.

236. a.

That whiche the authour speaketh to one effect, he bringeth to another. 147. a. 151. a. b

M. Ievvel ioyneth together doubtful pointes, flatte lyes, and true tales. 169. b

M. Iew. commonly bringeth in pieces, and maymed sentences of the Fathers. 193. a. b. 211. a

M. Ievvel leaueth out the nominatiue case, and changeth the first person singular into the third person plural. 138. a. b

M. Ievv. heweth away the principal membre of a sentence. 138. b

M. Ievv. deuifeth a new fallacie. 139.

M. Ievv. confuted by the places he bringeth. 145. a. b. 160. a. 191. a. b

M. Ievv. graueled with Irene. 150. b

M. Iew. cōfidence in lying, and denying most manifest Truthes. 155. b

M. Iewel inconstant in his termes. 159. a.

M. Iew. allegerh S. Augustin wher he hath no such thing at al. 159. a

M. Ievv. craueth helpe of the glose, vvhich he calleth barbarous. 159. b

M. Ievv. groundeth him selfe vppon the false translation of the English Bible. 166. b

M. Ievv. a scholer of Ihon Fox. 178. b

M. Ievvel vould the ciuil Magistrates iustice to be esteemed the Catholik Clergies crueltie. 179. a

XXX

The



## THE TABLE.

- The ende of M. Iewels doctrine  
against the blessed Sacrifice. 248.b
- Image vwhat it signifieth, and how  
it excludeth not the Truth. 161.a  
197.b
- Image and likenes how they signi-  
fie, being spoken of the Sacra-  
ment. 238.a
- Incense, pure Sacrifice. 59.b
- Prayer signified by Incense. 57.b  
58.a.62.a
- Infinuation of Christes Death what  
it meaneth in S. Augustine. 219.b
- Internal priesthod. 241.b
- Internal oblation pertaineth to al  
faithful people. 249.b
- K**
- Katherine the Nonne of Metz  
Peter Martyrs wyfe. 175.a
- Christen men in general how they  
be Kinges and Priestes. 12.b
- L**
- Lavves to punish Heretikes by  
death. Henrici. 5. an. 2. 178.b.  
& sequent.
- Lyes impudent in M. Iewel. 30.a  
118.b. 141.a. 147.a. 155.b. 171.a.
- Three lyes made by M. Iewel  
vvithin three lines. 113.a.
- A notorious and sclaunderous lye.  
177.a
- M**
- MAn mortal and miserable ad-  
mitted by God to great di-  
gnitie. 3.b. & seq.
- In Manna Christ vnderstode. 24.b
- Margaret wife of Dulcinus an Ada-  
mite. 186.a
- Mariage of Priestes. 165.b. & seq.
- Mariage not lawful for al without  
exception. 168.b
- The State of the question betwene  
vs and the Protestants for ma-  
riage. 174.a
- In what sence S. Paule calleth for-  
bidding of Mariage the doctrine  
of Devils. 169.a
- Martyrdome not argued by patiece  
in dying. 186.a.
- Martyrs of two sortes. 180.b
- The holy Martyrs of Iohn Fox. 181.a
- Tybourne Martyrs. 185.b.
- The prophecie of Malachie forefi-  
gnieth the sacrifice of the Masse.  
50.b. 52.a
- Chrysostom in his Masse prayeth  
for the pretious giftes. 255.b.
- Melchisedech a figure of Christe.  
50.a. 203.b. 208.b
- The Sacrifice after the order of Mel-  
chisedech was not onely vpon  
the Crosse, but also at the Supper.  
157.b.
- Christe at his Supper fulfilled the fi-  
gure of Melchisedech. 162.a
- Melchisedek offred bread and wine.  
47.b. 133.a. 203.a. 204.b. 206.  
& seq.
- Melchisedeks Sacrifice, and Christes  
both diuerse, and the same. 204.b
- Mel.

# THE TABLE.

Melchisedech in dignitie aboute Abraham. 208.b.  
 Mé helpers of God, and how. 120.b.  
 Men offer this Sacrifice, and be Priestes after Melchisedeks order vnder Christe. 126.b.  
 Michael Seruetus procured to be put to death for heresie, by Caluin and Beza. 179.a.  
 Ministers of this Sacrifice be al the people by M. Ievvel. 88.b.  
 The Ministracion of the new Communion a new Sacrifice by M. Ievvel. 95.b.  
 Mysteries of the olde testament not equal in dignitie, truth, &c. to ours of the newe testament. 22.b.  
 VVherein consisteth the memorie of Christes Death in our Mysteries. 160.a. & seq.  
 How Christe dyeth againe in this Mysterie. 161.b.  
 Our Mysteries not significatiue only. 197.a.  
 Mysteries kept secret, and for vvhath cause. 207.b. in the preface. 33.a.

N

Nicolas Marsh of Dednam, hanged for felonie, made a Martyr by Foxe. 181.a.

O

Oblation double, one in spirite onely, and the other in the Sacrament. 143.b.  
 Foure conditions of the Mystical

Oblation. 138.b.  
 Tvo Oblations of one body. 113.b.  
 VVordes of Oblation vvithout termes of Oblation. 63.b.  
 Oecumenius. 41.a. 215.a. & seq.  
 Sir Ihon Oldecastle and Sir Roger Acton, traytours, by Foxe made Martyrs. 181.a.  
 Of the terme Onely 103. & sequ.  
 Onely in a Mysterie, howv it is meant by M. Iew. 103.b. 104.a.  
 Onely figuratiue Sacrifice ouerthrowen. 133.b.  
 Optatus for the real presence. 92.  
 Origen alleaged to haue woordes vvwhich he hath not. 17.a.  
 Origen for the sacrifice. 27.b.  
 Origen belied of M. Ievvel, and reasons vvhy. 71.a.  
 The Origenians heresie. 177.a.  
 Holy Oile. 34.b.

P

Pachymeres proueth not M. Ievvels purpose. 14.b.  
 Patience in dying argueth not Martyrdom. 106.a.  
 Pachymeres answered. 135.b. & seq.  
 Paratine of Garnesey. 184. & seq.  
 Paulus tertius godly purpose. 177.a.  
 S. Paule vvwhether he vvhere married. 169.b.  
 S. Paule his Pristhod consisted not altogether in preaching. 18.a.  
 XXX ij Of

# THE TABLE.

Of vvhat Sacrifice. S. Paule speaketh	the Church.	235.b
Heb. 9. & 10.	Internal Priesthod.	241.b
Persecutions of two sortes.	External Priesthod.	242.a.
Peter Martyrs Euangelical wedlocke.	Authoritie to create Priestes leaue to the Church.	242.b
Peter the Germaine Foxes Martyr.	Deriuation of Priestly duetic.	243.a
181.a.	Special Priesthod.	244.b. & seq.
Prayer.	Priestes Christes vicars and substitutes in making this Sacrifice.	50.a.
VVhat is signified by the name of Prayer.		247.a.
Prayer take generally for the seruice of God.	Both Priest, and people offereth, and howe eche.	251.a
Pure Prayer what it signifieth by Tertullian.	The people offer by geuing assent to the Priestes action, and applying their deuotion.	Ibid.
55.a. by Euseb.	Real Priesthod in the Church now, ergo real Sacrifice.	11.b
Simple Prayer.	Christen men how they be Priestes in general, and also kinges.	12.b.
The Prayer of the Canon defended.	Priest in english a name common to Presbyter and Sacerdos.	13.a.
123. b	VVhy S. Paule calleth rather Priestes, then Sacrificers.	14.a.
The Prayer of the Canon expounded.	Priestes haue authoritie to offer vp Christe vnto his Father.	49.a.
255.b	50.a. b. 90.a. b. 143.b. 144.a. 190. b. 216 a.	
The Prayer of the Canon of the Masse defended.	Continuance of Priestes necessary.	49.b.
123. b. & c. 254. b	Priestes succede the Apostles in degree.	49.b. 64.a.
& sequent.	Iust punishment, merciful.	179.b
The Sacrifice of Praise how general it is.	R.	
144. b. & seq.	Real presence.	42.a. 72.a. 92.b.
Christe a Priest at his last Supper.	105.b. 107.b. 111.b. 112.a.	
73. b.	Real	
Priestes nowve by ordination and election, not by succession.		
26.a.		
Christe made the Apostles Priestes.		
87.a.		
The Priesthod after Melchisedechs order farre passeth the Leuitical Priesthod.		
209.a		
The Priesthod of Christe continueth stil both in heauen, and in		

## THE TABLE

Real presence and Sacrifice auouched by S. Chrysostom, dissembled by M. Ievvel. 72.a  
 Real Sacrifice. 35.b. 42.a. 253.a  
 The name of a Renegate, answered. 182.a.  
 V Who is a Renegate. Ibid.b  
 Reparatiō, repairing, or renewing and Representatiō of Christes Death, 219.a.  
 Robert King of Dednam, and Robert Debnam of Elsbergholt, hanged for felonie, Foxes Martyrs. 181.a.

### S

Sabbatum olde, and new. 8.b. 9.a  
 Real Sacrifice in the Church. 11.b. 105.b  
 The substance of the Sacrifice in both Testamentes diuers. 20.b  
 The substance of bread and vine hath no place in our Sacrifice. 21.a  
 The effectes of the Sacrifices of both Lavves diuers. Ibid.b. & seq.  
 Real and true Sacrifice, and Sacrifice in dede. 35.b  
 The Sacrifice of the Aulter a true and real Sacrifice. 36.b. 80.a. 98.b  
 Difference betwene a true, and the true Sacrifice. 40.b  
 The Sacrifice that we offer is the Passiō of Christ, and why. 41.b.  
 Christes body neuer ceased, nor shal cease to be a Sacrifice. 42.a

The fruites of this Sacrifice. 44.b. 45.a.  
 The Sacrifice of Christe auouched in the Gospel by S. Augustines iudgement. 45.b  
 Sacrifice spread over the worlde. Ibid.  
 In the Sacrifice of the Aulter al the conditions of Malachies prophcie are founde. 51.a  
 Sacrifices common to both Testamentes. 51.a  
 The Sacrifice of the Aulter succedeth al the Sacrifices of the olde Law. 51.b.  
 The properties attributed to this Sacrifice by Malachie. 63.a  
 Sacrifice auouched by S. Chrysostome. 72.b. 78.b. 105.b. 114.b. 119.b. 189.a. 192.a. 214.b. 226.b.  
 The Sacrifice of the Supper, and the Sacrifice of the Crosse, one, and diuers, in diuers respectes. 74.a. 78.b.  
 This Sacrifice auouched by the Nicen Council. 217.a.  
 How Christe sacrificeth. 221.b  
 Ten kindes of Sacrifices. 226.b  
 Three Sacrifices noted by S. Augustine. 237.b  
 Sacrifices of two sortes, inward, and outward. 239.b  
 This Sacrifice is external. 241.a  
 Sacrifice taken two waies. 74.a  
 This Sacrifice called Spiritual, and why. 79.a



## THE TABLE.

Three kinds of Sacrifices of the new Testament by Eusebius. 93.a

A memorie of the Sacrifice of the Crosse excludeth not the Sacrifice of the Aulter. 98.a

Reasons for this Sacrifice. 108.a. 137.b. 190.b.

This Sacrifice is a meane to deriue the effect of Christes Death vnto vs. 121.a.

This Sacrifice called the tradition of God. 131.b. & sequent.

V Why the Fathers spake at the beginning secretly of this Sacrifice. 132.b. And in the Preface. 33.a

In what sense the Sacrifice is Symbolical, or Figuratiue. 135.a

S. Dionyse for the Sacrifice. 137.a

S. Gregorie Nazianzene. for the external Sacrifice. 138.a

The Sacrifice of the Aulter, the Sacrifice of Praise. 145.a (237.a

The Singular Sacrifice. 145.a. 236.b. Our Sacrifice is the pure Sacrifice, and why. 151.a

S. Cyprian. euident for the Sacrifice. 156.a

The Sacrifice after Melchisedeks order both on the Crosse, and also at the Supper. 157.b

A plaine argument for the Sacrifice out of S. Chrysostō. 190.b. & seq.

The ende of Christes Sacrifice, and of ours. 192.b

Yf Christ leaſt no real Sacrifice to

his people, the new Law was left in worſe caſe then the olde &c. 104.b. & 105.a

Our Sacrifice a much more marue- lous and honorable sacrifice, then al other. 105.b

The substance of the Sacrifice on the Crosse, and Sacrifice on the Aul- ter al one. 113.b

The Sacrifice why of Malachie cal- led the pure Sacrifice. 151.a

The Sacrifice of Prayſe, how gene- ral it is. 144.b

Sacrifice, Priesthod, Law go ſo toge- ther, that the bettering of either of them doth infer the bettering of the other. 197.a

The difference of Christ being in the Sacrament, and in the reading of the storie of the Gospel. 199.a

The Sacrifice not to be consecrate, but only by the Special Priestes. 245.b. & seq. 248.a.

In this Sacrifice what is Christe, what are we. 247.a

This Sacrifice both Commemora- tiue, and real. 253.a

In this Sacrifice the Church is of- fred. 257.a

Spiritual Sacrifice, as a contrite hart and ſuch like, not the proper Sa- crifice of the new testamēt. 140.b

Sacerdotes, that is, Sacrificers be now properly in the Church. 13.b

The

## THE TABLE.

- The terme Sacerdos, Priest vsed of the Fathers, and how. 71.a. & seq. 11.b.
- The olde terme Sacrificer vsed after the destruction of Ierusalem. 14.a.
- The terme Sacrificer vsed by S. Dionyse. 15.a.
- VVhy S. Paule calleth the publike persones of the Church Priestes, rather then sacrificers. 14.a.
- Sacrament and Mysterie do not importe a signification of absense of the thing reported to be sacrificed &c. but the secret maner of sacrificing. &c. 77.b.
- VVhy the Sacrament is geuen vs in forme of bread and wine. 82.b. 83.a.
- The Sacrament called by the name of bread and vvine. 85.b.
- The Sacramentaries Argument. It is a signe of the bodie, ergo, not Christes true bodie, stark naught. 83.b.
- The true and real bloude of Christe in the Sacrament. 107.a.
- Sacrament of Remembrance. 239.a.
- If al be taken away that hath no proufe of Scripture, what inconuenience vvil folowve. 4.b.
- A Shifte of the newe Gospellers against the Fathers testimonies for the Sacrifice. 8.a. 218.a.
- Sicuti(as,) in the Canõ reporteth not equalitie, but likenes. 124.b. 258.b.
- Signes of two fortes, significative onely, and exhibitue. 83.b.
- A Syster woman, vvhat it meaneth in S. Paule. 166.b. & seq.
- Spiridion made bisshop after he had ben married. 171.b.
- Spiridion not proued by Sozomenus to be a married Bisshop. 172.a.
- Spiritual Sacrifices, Spiritual Priesthood. 250.a.
- The reproche of Straggling alone answered. 67.a. & sequent.
- T.
- Table. 225.b. 230.a.
- Temple. 9.b.
- Thinges signifying, and thinges signified called by the same names, and how. 111.b. 112.a. b.
- Thinges implied though not vttered in expresse Termes. 66.b.
- Thraso his parte played by the Challenger, rather then by the defender. 261.b.
- The olde translation of the testament not controlled by Catholics. 70.a.
- Translatours of the Bible into English false harlots. 167.b.
- Tertullian no martyr. 172.b.
- How the Church speaketh vvith al tongues. 200.b.
- Transsubstantiation. 29.a. b. 33.a. 84.b. 92.b. 112.a. 136.a.

# THE TABLE.

ne Truth put away by an other  
truth, M. Jewels common cu-  
stome. 16. b. 17. b. 26. b. 27. b. 32. b.  
59. a. 98. b. 165. a. 195. a. 198. b. 202.  
b. 223. a. 227. b. 233. a. 239. b.  
Truth not excluded by Image. 161. a.  
Vnbloudy Sacrifice. 37. a. b. 41. a.  
52. a. 77. a. b. 78. a. 102. a. 114. a.  
b. 127. a. b.  
Vnbloudy shedding of bloude. 76. b.  
77. a. & b.  
Vnbloudy Death. 162. b.  
Vnbloudy spoken of the Sacrifice of  
the Aulter. 247. b.  
Christe offered his ovvne body vn-  
bloudily. 215. b.  
Bloudy and vnbloudy referred to  
one subiecte. 126. a.  
Vntruthes vttered by M. Jewell,  
three at once. 10. b. 113. a. 147. a.  
An impudent vntruth and lye that

can not be excused. 30. a. 34. b.  
171. a. 177. a.  
Vie and obseruation of Sabbatum  
to Pascha, Altare &c. double, olde,  
and newve. 8. b. 9. a.  
W.

WHY Christ gaue his body and  
bloud vnder the formes of  
bread and vvine. 30. a.  
Viat beheaded. 183. b.  
Vviued Apostates and their vvylse-  
dom. 168. a.  
VViclef. 142. b.  
VVordes vsed of the Fathers to ex-  
presse the manner of this bloud-  
dy Sacrifice. 77. a.  
VVilliam Cowbridge, Foxes Mar-  
tyr. 181. a.  
VVilliam Flowver Foxes Martyr.  
Ibid. a.  
Yoke fellowe man. 168. a.

*Liber iste lectus est & approbatus à viris sacra Theologia, & Angli-  
ci Idiomatis peritisimis, quibus, sicut & ipsi Authori M. N. Thoma  
Hardingo, iudè credendum iudico. Quare sine scrupulo videndum esse  
existimo, & magnam ex hoc argumento utilitatem spero.*



Catherus Petri, Pastor S. Petri.  
Lond. 23. Augusti. An. 1567.

4.6.

um

de,

9.a

and

s of

5.a.

3.b.

yfe-

8.a.

2.b.

ex-

oud-

7.a.

Mar-

81.a

yr.

o

et

8.a.

8

et

u

662

de II

9

9

Pe/hi.

3567.

1

12

7